00029999

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 23 March, 2016

HISTORY OF GREECE.

BY

GEORGE GROTE, Esq.

29999°

VOL. XII.

WITH PORTRAIT, MAPS, AND INDEX.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1856.

Q738
G70|N11S

00029999

GEORGE GROTE.

Ætatis 47.

From a bust by Behnes in the possession of Raikes Currie Esq. M.P.

CONTENTS.

VOL. XII.

CHAPTER XCI.

First Period of the Reign of Alexander the Great—Siege and Capture of Thebes.

	Page
State of Greece at Alexander's accession—dependence on the Macedonian kings	1
Unwilling subjection of the Greeks—influence of Grecian intelligence on Macedonia	2
Basis of Alexander's character—not Hellenic	3
Boyhood and education of Alexander	*ib.*
He receives instruction from Aristotle	4
Early political action and maturity of Alexander—his quarrels with his father. Family discord	5
Uncertainty of Alexander's position during the last year of Philip	6
Impression produced by the sudden death of Philip	8
Accession of Alexander—his energy and judgment	9
Accomplices of Pausanias are slain by Alexander—Amyntas and others are slain by him also	*ib.*
Sentiment at Athens on the death of Philip—language of Demosthenes—inclination to resist Macedonia, yet without overt act	12
Discontent in Greece—but no positive movement	14
March of Alexander into Greece—submission of Athens	15
Alexander is chosen Imperator of the Greeks in the convention at Corinth—continued refusal of concurrence by Sparta	17
Conditions of the vote thus passed—privileges guaranteed to the cities	18
Authority claimed by Alexander under the convention—degradation of the leading Grecian states	20
Encroachments and tyranny of the Macedonian officers in Greece—complaints of the orators at Athens	21
Violations of the convention at sea by Macedonian officers	23

Page

Language of the complaining Athenians—they insist only on strict observance of the convention. Boldness of their language 25
Encouragements held out by Persia to the Greeks 27
Correspondence of Demosthenes with Persia — justifiable and politic..... 28
March of Alexander into Thrace. He forces his way over Mount Hæmus 29
His victory over the Triballi 31
He crosses the Danube, defeats the Getæ, and returns back 32
Embassy of Gauls to Alexander. His self-conceit..... 35
Victories of Alexander over Kleitus and the Illyrians 36
The Thebans declare their independence against Macedonia 39
They are encouraged by Alexander's long absence in Thrace, and by reports of his death..... 41
The Theban exiles from Athens get possession of Thebes..... 42
They besiege the Macedonians in the Kadmeia, and entreat aid from other Greeks. Favourable sympathies shown towards them, but no positive aid 44
Chances of Thebes and liberation, not unfavourable..... 45
Rapid march and unexpected arrival of Alexander with his army before Thebes. His good fortune as to the time of hearing the news 48
Siege of Thebes. Proclamation of Alexander. Determination of the Thebans to resist 50
Capture of Thebes by assault. Massacre of the population 51
Thebes is razed; the Theban captives sold as slaves; the territory distributed among the neighbouring cities..... 54
The Kadmeia is occupied as a Macedonian military post. Retribution upon the Thebans from Orchomenus and Platæa 55
Sentiments of Alexander, at the time and afterwards, respecting the destruction of Thebes..... 56
Extreme terror spread throughout Greece. Sympathy of the Athenians towards the Theban exiles..... 58
Alexander demands the surrender of the chief anti-Macedonian leaders at Athens. Memorable debate at Athens. The demand refused 60
Embassy of the Athenians to Alexander. He is persuaded to acquiesce in the refusal, and to be satisfied with the banishment of Charidemus and Ephialtes 62
Influence of Phokion in obtaining these milder terms—his increased ascendency at Athens 63
Alexander at Corinth—obedience of the Grecian synod—interview with the philosopher Diogenes 64

Page

Re-constitution of Orchomenus and Platæa. Return of Alexander to Pella 65
Military operations of Parmenio in Asia Minor against Memnon.. *ib.*

CHAPTER XCII.

Asiatic Campaigns of Alexander.

During Alexander's reign, the history of Greece is nearly a blank, 67
To what extent the Asiatic projects of Alexander belonged to Grecian history 68
Pan-hellenic pretences set up by Alexander. The real feeling of the Greeks was adverse to his success..... 69
Analogy of Alexander's relation to the Greeks—with those of the Emperor Napoleon to the Confederation of the Rhine..... *ib.*
Greece an appendage, but a valuable appendage, to Macedonia .. 71
Extraordinary military endowments and capacity of Alexander .. *ib.*
Changes in Grecian warfare, antecedent and contributory to the military organization of Macedonia..... 72
Macedonian military condition before Philip. Good and firm cavalry: poor infantry..... 75
Philip re-arms and re-organises the infantry. Long Macedonian pike or sarissa 77
Macedonian phalanx—how armed and arrayed ..... *ib.*
It was originally destined to contend against the Grecian hoplites as organised by Epaminondas 79
Regiments and divisions of the phalanx—heavy-armed infantry.. 80
Light infantry of the line—Hypaspistæ, or Guards 82
Light troops generally—mostly foreigners..... 83
Macedonian cavalry—its excellence—how regimented 84
The select Macedonian Body-guards. The Royal Pages..... 86
Foreign auxiliaries—Grecian hoplites—Thessalian cavalry—Pæonians—Illyrians—Thracians, &c..... 88
Magazines, war-office, and depôt, at Pella 89
Macedonian aptitudes—purely military—military pride stood to them in lieu of national sentiment 90
Measures of Alexander previous to his departure for Asia. Antipater left as viceroy at Pella..... *ib.*
March of Alexander to the Hellespont. Passage across to Asia.. 93
Visit of Alexander to Ilium ..... *ib.*
Analogy of Alexander to the Greek heroes..... 95
Review and total of the Macedonian army in Asia 96
Chief Macedonian officers..... 98

Page
Greeks in Alexander's service—Eumenes of Kardia 99
Persian forces—Mentor and Memnon the Rhodians 100
Succession of the Persian crown—Ochus—Darius Codomannus .. 102
Preparations of Darius for defence ..... *ib.*
Operations of Memnon before Alexander's arrival 103
Superiority of the Persians at sea: their imprudence in letting Alexander cross the Hellespont unopposed 104
Persian force assembled in Phrygia, under Arsites and others ... 105
Advice of Memnon, to avoid fighting on land, and to employ the fleet for aggressive warfare in Macedonia and Greece ..... *ib.*
Arsites rejects Memnon's advice, and determines to fight 106
The Persians take post on the river Granikus 107
Alexander reaches the Granikus, and resolves to force the passage at once, in spite of the dissuasion of Parmenio 108
Disposition of the two armies 109
Battle of the Granikus 110
Cavalry battle. Personal danger of Alexander. His life is saved by Kleitus 113
Complete victory of Alexander. Destruction of the Grecian infantry on the side of the Persians 114
Loss of the Persians—numbers of their leading men slain 115
Small loss of the Macedonians 116
Alexander's kindness to his wounded soldiers, and severe treatment of the Grecian prisoners 117
Unskilfulness of the Persian leaders. Immense impression produced by Alexander's victory 118
Terror and submission of the Asiatics to Alexander. Surrender of the strong fortress of Sardis 119
He marches from Sardis to the coast. Capture of Ephesus 121
He finds the first resistance at Miletus 122
Near approach of the Persian fleet. Memnon is made commander-in-chief of the Persians 123
The Macedonian fleet occupies the harbour of Miletus, and keeps out the Persians. Alexander declines naval combat. His debate with Parmenio 124
Alexander besieges Miletus. Capture of the city 125
The Persian fleet retires to Halikarnassus. Alexander disbands his own fleet 126
March of Alexander to Halikarnassus. Ada queen of Karia joins him 127
Strong garrison, and good defensive preparation, at Halikarnassus 128
Siege of Halikarnassus. Bravery of the garrison, under Ephialtes the Athenian ..... *ib.*

Page
Desperate sally of Ephialtes—at first successful, but repulsed—he himself is slain 131
Memnon is forced to abandon Halikarnassus, and withdraw the garrison by sea, retaining only the citadel. Alexander enters Halikarnassus 133
Winter campaign of Alexander along the southern coast of Asia Minor 134
Alexander concludes his winter campaign at Gordium. Capture of Kelænæ 136
Appendix on the Macedonian Sarissa ..... *ib.*

CHAPTER XCIII.

Second and Third Asiatic Campaigns of Alexander—Battle of Issus—Siege of Tyre.

Alexander cuts the Gordian knot 140
He refuses the liberation of the Athenian prisoners 141
Progress of Memnon and the Persian fleet—they acquire Chios and a large part of Lesbos—they besiege Mitylene. Death of Memnon. Capture of Mitylene ..... *ib.*
Hopes excited in Greece by the Persian fleet; but ruined by the death of Memnon 142
Memnon's death an irreparable mischief to Darius 143
Change in Darius's plan caused by this event. He resolves to take the offensive on land. His immense land-force 144
Free speech and sound judgment of Charidemus. He is put to death by Darius 145
Darius abandoned Memnon's plans, just at the time when he had the best defensive position for executing them with effect 147
Darius recalls the Grecian mercenaries from the fleet 148
Criticism of Arrian on Darius's plan ..... *ib.*
March of Alexander from Gordium through Paphlagonia and Kappadokia 149
He arrives at the line of Mount Taurus—difficulties of the pass .. 150
Conduct of Arsames, the Persian satrap. Alexander passes Mount Taurus without the least resistance. He enters Tarsus 151
Dangerous illness of Alexander. His confidence in the physician Philippus, who cures him 152
Operations of Alexander in Kilikia 153
March of Alexander out of Kilikia, through Issus, to Myriandrus. 154
March of Darius from the interior to the eastern side of Mount Amanus. Immense numbers of his army: great wealth and ostentation in it: the treasure and baggage sent to Damascus.. 155

Page
Position of Darius on the plain eastward of Mount Amanus. He throws open the mountain passes, to let Alexander come through, and fight a pitched battle 156
Impatience of Darius at the delay of Alexander in Kilikia. He crosses Mount Amanus to attack Alexander in the defiles of Kilikia ..... *ib.*
He arrives in Alexander's rear, and captures Issus 158
Return of Alexander from Myriandrus: his address to his army ..... *ib.*
Position of the Macedonian army south of the river Pinarus 159
Position of the Persian army north of the Pinarus 160
Battle of Issus 162
Alarm and immediate flight of Darius—defeat of the Persians 165
Vigorous and destructive pursuit by Alexander—capture of the mother and wife of Darius 166
Courteous treatment of the regal female prisoners by Alexander 167
Complete dispersion of the Persian army—Darius recrosses the Euphrates—escape of some Perso-Grecian mercenaries 168
Prodigious effect produced by the victory of Issus 170
Effects produced in Greece by the battle of Issus. Anti-Macedonian projects crushed 172
Capture of Damascus by the Macedonians, with Persian treasure and prisoners 173
Capture and treatment of the Athenian Iphikrates. Altered relative position of Greeks and Macedonians 175
Alexander in Phenicia. Aradus, Byblus, and Sidon open their gates to him ..... *ib.*
Letter of Darius soliciting peace and the restitution of the regal captives. Haughty reply of Alexander 176
Importance of the voluntary surrender of the Phenician towns to Alexander 178
Alexander appears before Tyre—readiness of the Tyrians to surrender, yet not without a point reserved—he determines to besiege the city 179
Exorbitant dispositions and conduct of Alexander 181
He prepares to besiege Tyre—situation of the place 183
Chances of the Tyrians—their resolution not unreasonable ..... *ib.*
Alexander constructs a mole across the strait between Tyre and the mainland. The project is defeated 185
Surrender of the princes of Cyprus to Alexander—he gets hold of the main Phenician and Cyprian fleet 186
He appears before Tyre with a numerous fleet, and blocks up the place by sea 187
Capture of Tyre by storm—desperate resistance of the citizens .. 188

Page
Surviving males, 2000 in number, hanged by order of Alexander. The remaining captives sold 189
Duration of the siege for seven months. Sacrifice of Alexander to Herakles 190
Second letter from Darius to Alexander, who requires unconditional submission ..... *ib.*
The Macedonian fleet overpowers the Persian, and becomes master of the Ægean with the islands 191
March of Alexander towards Egypt—siege of Gaza 193
His first assaults fail—he is wounded—he erects an immense mound round the town 194
Gaza is taken by storm, after a siege of two months 195
The garrison are all slain, except the governor Batis, who becomes prisoner, severely wounded ..... *ib.*
Wrath of Alexander against Batis, whom he causes to be tied to a chariot, and dragged round the town 196
Alexander enters Egypt, and occupies it without resistance 197
He determines on founding Alexandria 198
His visit to the temple and oracle of Ammon. The oracle proclaims him to be the son of Zeus 200
Arrangements made by Alexander at Memphis—Grecian prisoners brought from the Ægean 203
He proceeds to Phenicia—message from Athens. Splendid festivals. Reinforcements sent to Antipater ..... *ib.*
He marches to the Euphrates, crosses it without opposition at Thapsakus 204
March across from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Alexander fords the Tigris above Nineveh, without resistance ..... *ib.*
Eclipse of the moon. Alexander approaches near to the army of Darius in position 205
Inaction of Darius since the defeat at Issus 206
Paralysing effect upon him produced by the captivity of his mother and wife 207
Good treatment of the captive females by Alexander—necessary to keep up their value as hostages 208
Immense army collected by Darius, in the plains eastward of the Tigris—near Arbela 209
He fixes the spot for encamping and awaiting the attack of Alexander—in a level plain near Gaugamela 210
His equipment and preparation—better arms—numerous scythed chariots—elephants 211
Position and battle array of Darius 212
Preliminary movements of Alexander—discussions with Parmenio and other officers. His careful reconnoitring in person 213

Page
Dispositions of Alexander for the attack—array of the troops.... 215
Battle of Arbela 216
Cowardice of Darius—he sets the example of flight—defeat of the Persians..... 219
Combat on the Persian right between Mazæus and Parmenio.... 222
Flight of the Persian host—energetic pursuit by Alexander..... 225
Escape of Darius. Capture of the Persian camp, and of Arbela.. 226
Loss in the battle. Completeness of the victory. Entire and irreparable dispersion of the Persian army ..... *ib.*
Causes of the defeat—cowardice of Darius. Uselessness of his immense numbers..... *ib.*
Generalship of Alexander..... 228
Surrender of Babylon and Susa, the two great capitals of Persia. Alexander enters Babylon. Immense treasures acquired in both places..... *ib.*
Alexander acts as king of Persia, and nominates satraps. He marches to Susa. He remodels the divisions of his army 229
Alexander marches into Persis proper—he conquers the refractory Uxii, in the intermediate mountains 231
Difficult pass called the Susian Gates, on the way to Persepolis. Ariobarzanes the satrap repulses Alexander, who finds means to turn the pass, and conquer it 232
Alexander enters Persepolis..... 234
Mutilated Grecian captives ..... *ib.*
Immense wealth, and national monuments of every sort, accumulated in Persepolis..... 236
Alexander appropriates and carries away the regal treasures, and then gives up Persepolis to be plundered and burnt by the soldiers 237
Alexander rests his troops, and employs himself in conquering the rest of Persis..... 240
Darius a fugitive in Media 241

CHAPTER XCIV.

Military Operations and Conquests of Alexander, after his Winter-Quarters in Persis, down to his Death at Babylon.

The first four Asiatic campaigns of Alexander—their direct bearing and importance in reference to Grecian history..... 242
His last seven years, farther eastward, had no similar bearing upon Greece 243

Page
Darius at Ekbatana—seeks escape towards Baktria, when he hears of Alexander approaching 244
Alexander enters Ekbatana—establishes there his depôt and base of operations 245
Alexander sends home the Thessalian cavalry—necessity for him now to pursue a more desultory warfare 246
Alexander pursues Darius to the Caspian Gates, but fails in overtaking him 247
Conspiracy formed against Darius by Bessus and others, who seize his person 248
Prodigious efforts of Alexander to overtake and get possession of Darius. He surprises the Persian corps, but Bessus puts Darius to death 250
Disappointment of Alexander when he missed taking Darius alive. 252
Regal funeral bestowed upon Darius. His fate and conduct .... *ib.*
Repose of Alexander and his army at Hekatompylus in Parthia. Commencing alteration in his demeanour. He becomes Asiatized and despotic 253
Gradual aggravation of these new habits, from the present moment 254
Alexander conquers the mountains immediately south of the Caspian. He requires the Greek mercenaries to surrender at discretion ..... *ib.*
Envoys from Sparta and other Greek cities brought to him—how treated 256
March of Alexander farther eastward—his successes in Aria and Drangiana 257
Proceedings against Philotas, son of Parmenio, in Drangiana. Military greatness and consideration of the family 258
Revelation of an intended conspiracy made by Kebalinus to Philotas, for the purpose of being communicated to Alexander. Philotas does not mention it to Alexander. It is communicated to the latter through another channel 259
Alexander is at first angry with Philotas, but accepts his explanation, and professes to pass over the fact ..... *ib.*
Ancient grudge against Philotas—advantage taken of the incident to ruin him 260
Kraterus and others are jealous of Parmenio and Philotas. Alexander is persuaded to put them both to death ..... *ib.*
Arrest of Philotas. Alexander accuses him before the assembled soldiers. He is condemned 262
Philotas is put to the torture, and forced to confess, both against himself and Parmenio 264
Parmenio is slain at Ekbatana, by order and contrivance of Alexander 266

Page
Mutiny of the soldiers when they learn the assassination of Parmenio—appeased by the production of Alexander's order ... 268
Fear and disgust produced by the killing of Parmenio and Philotas ... 269
Conquest of the Paropamisadæ, &c. Foundation of Alexandria *ad Caucasum* ... 270
Alexander crosses the Hindoo-Koosh, and conquers Baktria. Bessus is made prisoner ... 272
Massacre of the Branchidæ and their families, perpetrated by Alexander in Sogdiana ... 274
Alexander at Marakanda and on the Jaxartes ... 276
Foundation of Alexandria *ad Jaxartem*. Limit of march northward ... 277
Alexander at Zariaspa in Baktria—he causes Bessus to be mutilated and slain ... 278
Farther subjugation of Baktria and Sogdiana. Halt at Marakanda. 280
Banquet at Marakanda. Character and position of Kleitus ... 281
Boasts of Alexander and his flatterers—repugnance of Macedonian officers felt, but not expressed ... *ib.*
Scene at the banquet—vehement remonstrance of Kleitus ... 283
Furious wrath of Alexander—he murders Kleitus ... *ib.*
Intense remorse of Alexander, immediately after the deed ... 286
Active and successful operations of Alexander in Sogdiana ... 288
Capture of two inexpugnable positions—the Sogdian rock—the rock of Choriénes. Passion of Alexander for Roxana ... 289
Alexander at Baktra—marriage with Roxana. His demand for prostration or worship from all ... 290
Public harangue of Anaxarchus during a banquet, exhorting every one to render this worship ... *ib.*
Public reply of Kallisthenes, opposing it. Character and history of Kallisthenes ... 291
The reply of Kallisthenes is favourably heard by the guests—the proposition for worship is dropped ... 294
Coldness and disfavour of Alexander towards Kallisthenes ... 295
Honourable frankness and courage of Kallisthenes ... *ib.*
Kallisthenes becomes odious to Alexander ... 298
Conspiracy of the royal pages against Alexander's life—it is divulged—they are put to torture, but implicate no one else; they are put to death ... *ib.*
Kallisthenes is arrested as an accomplice—antipathy manifested by Alexander against him, and against Aristotle also ... 300
Kallisthenes is tortured and hanged ... 302
Alexander reduces the country between the Hindoo-Koosh and the Indus ... *ib.*

Page
Conquest of tribes on the right bank of the Indus—the Rock of Aornos 303
Alexander crosses the Indus—forces the passage of the Hydaspes, defeating Porus—generous treatment of Porus 306
His farther conquests in the Punjab. Sangala, the last of them.. 308
He reaches the Hyphasis (Sutledge), the farthest of the rivers of the Punjab. His army refuses to march farther 311
Alexander returns to the Hydaspes..... 313
He constructs a fleet, and sails down the Hydaspes and the Indus. Dangerous wound of Alexander in attacking the Malli..... *ib.*
New cities and posts to be established on the Indus—Alexander reaches the ocean—effect of the first sight of tides 316
March of Alexander by land westward through the desert of Gedrosia—sufferings and losses in the army 317
Alexander and the army come back to Persis. Conduct of Alexander at Persepolis. Punishment of the satrap Orsines 318
He marches to Susa—junction with the fleet under Nearchus, after it had sailed round from the mouth of the Indus 320
Alexander at Susa as Great King. Subjects of uneasiness to him —the satraps—the Macedonian soldiers..... 321
Past conduct of the satraps—several of them are punished by Alexander—alarm among them all—flight of Harpalus ..... *ib.*
Discontents of the Macedonian soldiers with the Asiatising intermarriages promoted by Alexander 324
Their discontent with the new Asiatic soldiers levied and disciplined by Alexander..... 325
Interest of Alexander in the fleet, which sails up the Tigris to Opis. 326
Notice of partial discharge to the Macedonian soldiers—they mutiny —wrath of Alexander—he disbands them all..... 327
Remorse and humiliation of the soldiers—Alexander is appeased—reconciliation..... 328
Partial disbanding—body of veterans placed under command of Kraterus to return..... 329
New projects of conquests contemplated by Alexander—measures for enlarging his fleet 330
Visit to Ekbatana—death of Hephæstion—violent sorrow of Alexander 331
Alexander exterminates the Kossæi..... 333
March of Alexander to Babylon. Numerous embassies which met him on the way..... 334
Alexander at Babylon—his great preparations for the circumnavigation and conquest of Arabia..... 336
Alexander on shipboard, on the Euphrates and in the marshes adjoining. His plans for improving the navigation and flow of the river 337

Page

Large reinforcements arrive, Grecian and Asiatic. New army ordered by Alexander, for Macedonians and Persians in the same files and companies 338
Splendid funeral obsequies of Hephæstion..... 339
General feasting and intemperance in the army. Alexander is seized with a dangerous fever. Details of his illness 342
No hope of his life. Consternation and grief in the army. Last interview with his soldiers. His death 345
Effect produced on the imagination of contemporaries by the career and death of Alexander..... 346
Had Alexander lived, he must have achieved things greater still.. 349
Question raised by Livy, about the chances of Alexander if he had attacked the Romans 350
Unrivalled excellence of Alexander, as a military man 351
Alexander as a ruler, apart from military affairs—not deserving of esteem 352
Alexander would have continued the system of the Persian empire, with no other improvement except that of a strong organization 354
Absence of nationality in Alexander—purpose of fusing the different varieties of mankind into one common type of subjection. 355
Mistake of supposing Alexander to be the intentional diffuser of Greek civilization. His ideas compared with those of Aristotle 357
Number of new cities founded in Asia by Alexander..... 360
It was not Alexander, but the Diadochi after him, who chiefly hellenized Asia 362
How far Asia was ever really hellenized—the great fact was, that the Greek language became universally diffused 363
Greco-Asiatic cities 364
Increase of the means of communication between various parts of the world 366
Interest of Alexander in science and literature—not great 369

CHAPTER XCV.

Grecian Affairs from the Landing of Alexander in Asia to the close of the Lamian War.

State of the Grecian world when Alexander crossed the Hellespont. 370
Grecian spirit might have been called into action if the Persians had played their game well 371
Hopes raised in Greece, first by the Persian fleet in the Ægean, next by the two great Persian armies on land 372
Public acts and policy at Athens—decidedly pacific 373

Page
Phokion and Demades were leading ministers at Athens—they were of macedonizing politics 374
Demosthenes and Lykurgus, though not in the ascendent politically, are nevertheless still public men of importance. Financial activity of Lykurgus 375
Position of Demosthenes—his prudent conduct 376
Anti-Macedonian movement from Sparta—King Agis visits the Persian admirals in the Ægean. His attempts both in Krete and in Peloponnesus 378
Agis levies an army in Peloponnesus, and makes open declaration against Antipater 380
Agis, at first partially successful, is completely defeated by Antipater, and slain 382
Complete submission of all Greece to Antipater—Spartan envoys sent up to Alexander in Asia 383
Untoward result of the defensive efforts of Greece—want of combination 384
Position of parties at Athens during the struggle of Agis—reaction of the macedonizing party after his defeat 385
Judicial contest between Æschines and Demosthenes. Preliminary circumstances as to the proposition of Ktesiphon, and the indictment by Æschines ..... *ib.*
Accusatory harangue of Æschines, nominally against the proposition of Ktesiphon, really against the political life of Demosthenes. 388
Appreciation of Æschines, on independent evidence, as an accuser of Demosthenes 390
Reply of Demosthenes—oration De Coronâ 391
Funeral oration of extinct Grecian freedom 393
Verdict of the Dikasts — triumph of Demosthenes — exile of Æschines 394
Causes of the exile of Æschines—he was the means of procuring coronation for Demosthenes 395
Subsequent accusation against Demosthenes, in the affair of Harpalus 396
Flight of Harpalus to Athens—his previous conduct and relations with Athens 397
False reports conveyed to Alexander, that the Athenians had identified themselves with Harpalus 398
Circumstances attending the arrival of Harpalus at Sunium—debate in the Athenian assembly—promises held out by Harpalus —the Athenians seem at first favourably disposed towards him.. 400
Phokion and Demosthenes both agree in dissuading the Athenians from taking up Harpalus 402
Demand by Antipater for the surrender of Harpalus—the Athe-

Page
nians refuse to comply, but they arrest Harpalus and sequestrate his treasure for Alexander ... 402
Demosthenes moves the decree for arrest of Harpalus, who is arrested, but escapes ... 403
Conduct of Demosthenes in regard to the treasure of Harpalus—deficiency of the sum counted and realized, as compared with the sum announced by Harpalus ... 404
Suspicions about this money—Demosthenes moves that the Areopagus shall investigate the matter—the Areopagites bring in a report against Demosthenes himself, with Demades and others, as guilty of corrupt appropriation. Demosthenes is tried on this charge, condemned, and goes into exile ... 405
Was Demosthenes guilty of such corrupt appropriation? Circumstances as known in the case ... 407
Demosthenes could not have received money from Harpalus, since he opposed him from first to last ... 408
Had Demosthenes the means of embezzling, after the money had passed out of the control of Harpalus? Answer in the negative. 409
Accusatory speech of Deinarchus against Demosthenes—virulent invective destitute of facts ... 412
Change of mind respecting Demosthenes, in the Athenian public, in a few months ... 413
Probable reality of the case, respecting the money of Harpalus, and the sentence of the Areopagus ... *ib.*
Rescript of Alexander to the Grecian cities, directing that the exiles should be recalled in each ... 416
Purpose of the rescript—to provide partisans for Alexander in each of the cities. Discontents in Greece ... 417
Effect produced in Greece by the death of Alexander ... 419
The Athenians declare themselves champions of the liberation of Greece, in spite of Phokion's opposition ... *ib.*
The Ætolians and many other Greeks join the confederacy for liberation—activity of the Athenian Leosthenes as general. Athenian envoys sent round to invite co-operation from the various Greeks ... 421
Assistance lent to the Athenian envoys by Demosthenes, though in exile. He is recalled to Athens, and receives an enthusiastic welcome ... 422
Large Grecian confederacy against Antipater—nevertheless without Sparta. Bœotia strongly in the Macedonian interest. Leosthenes with the confederate army marches into Thessaly ... 423
Battle in Thessaly—victory of Leosthenes over Antipater, who is compelled to throw himself into Lamia, and await succours from Asia—Leosthenes forms the blockade of Lamia; he is slain ... 424

Page
Misfortune of the death of Leosthenes. Antiphilus is named in his place. Relaxed efforts of the Grecian army 425
Leonnatus, with a Macedonian army from Asia, arrives in Thessaly. His defeat and death. Antipater escapes from Lamia, and takes the command 427
War carried on by sea between the Macedonian and Athenian fleets ..... *ib.*
Reluctance of the Greek contingents to remain on long-continued service. The army in Thessaly is thinned by many returning home 428
Expected arrival of Kraterus to reinforce Antipater. Relations between the Macedonian officers 429
State of the regal family, and of the Macedonian generals and soldiery, after the death of Alexander. ..... *ib.*
Philip Aridæus is proclaimed king: the satrapies are distributed among the principal officers. 430
Perdikkas the chief representative of central authority, assisted by Eumenes of Kardia ..... *ib.*
List of projects entertained by Alexander at the time of his death. The generals dismiss them as too vast. Plans of Leonnatus and Kleopatra 431
Kraterus joins Antipater in Macedonia with a powerful army. Battle of Krannon in Thessaly. Antipater gains a victory over the Greeks, though not a complete one 433
Antiphilus tries to open negotiations with Antipater, who refuses to treat, except with each city singly. Discouragement among the Greeks. Each city treats separately. Antipater grants favourable terms to all, except Athenians and Ætolians. 434
Antipater and his army in Bœotia—Athens left alone and unable to resist. Demosthenes and the other anti-Macedonian orators take flight. Embassy of Phokion, Xenokrates, and others to Antipater 435
Severe terms imposed upon Athens by Antipater 436
Disfranchisement and deportation of the 12,000 poorest Athenian citizens 437
Hardship suffered by the deported poor of Athens—Macedonian garrison placed in Munychia 438
Demosthenes, Hyperides, and others, are condemned to death in their absence. Antipater sends officers to track and seize the Grecian exiles. He puts Hyperides to death 439
Demosthenes in sanctuary at Kalauria—Archias with Thracian soldiers comes to seize him—he takes poison, and dies. 440
Miserable condition of Greece—life and character of Demosthenes. 442
Dishonourable position of Phokion at Athens, under the Macedonian occupation. 444

CHAPTER XCVI.

From the Lamian War to the close of the History of Free Hellas and Hellenism.

Page

Antipater purges and remodels the Peloponnesian cities. He attacks the Ætolians, with a view of deporting them across to Asia. His presence becomes necessary in Asia: he concludes a pacification with the Ætolians 447

Plans of Perdikkas—intrigues with the princesses at Pella 448

Antigonus detects the intrigues, and reveals them to Antipater and Kraterus 450

Unpropitious turn of fortune for the Greeks, in reference to the Lamian war 451

Antipater and Kraterus in Asia—Perdikkas marches to attack Ptolemy in Egypt, but is killed by a mutiny of his own troops. Union of Antipater, Ptolemy, Antigonus, &c. New distribution of the satrapies, made at Triparadeisus 452

War between Antigonus and Eumenes in Asia. Energy and ability of Eumenes. He is worsted, and blocked up in Nora 455

Sickness and death of Antipater. The Athenian orator Demades is put to death in Macedonia 456

Antipater sets aside his son Kassander, and names Polysperchon viceroy. Discontent and opposition of Kassander 457

Kassander sets up for himself, gets possession of Munychia, and forms alliance with Ptolemy and Antigonus against Polysperchon. *ib.*

Plans of Polysperchon—alliance with Olympias in Europe, and with Eumenes in Asia—enfranchisement of the Grecian cities. 458

Ineffectual attempts of Eumenes to uphold the imperial dynasty in Asia: his gallantry and ability: he is betrayed by his own soldiers, and slain by Antigonus 459

Edict issued by Polysperchon at Pella, in the name of the imperial dynasty—subverting the Antipatrian oligarchies in the Grecian cities, restoring political exiles, and granting free constitutions to each 462

Letters and measures of Polysperchon to enforce the edict. State of Athens: exiles returning: complicated political parties: danger of Phokion 464

Negotiations of the Athenians with Nikanor, governor of Munychia for Kassander 465

Nikanor seizes Peiræus by surprise. Phokion, though forewarned, takes no precautions against it 467

Mischief to the Athenians, as well as to Polysperchon, from Nikanor's occupation of Peiræus; culpable negligence, and probable collusion, of Phokion 468

Page

Arrival of Alexander (son of Polysperchon): his treacherous policy to the Athenians; Kassander reaches Peiræus 469

Intrigues of Phokion with Alexander—he tries to secure for himself the protection of Alexander against the Athenians..... 470

Return of the deported exiles to Athens—public vote passed in the Athenian assembly against Phokion and his colleagues. Phokion leaves the city, is protected by Alexander, and goes to meet Polysperchon in Phokis 471

Agnonides and others are sent as deputies to Polysperchon, to accuse Phokion and to claim the benefit of the regal edict 472

Agnonides and Phokion are heard before Polysperchon—Phokion and his colleagues are delivered up as prisoners to the Athenians 473

Phokion is conveyed as prisoner to Athens, and brought for trial before the assembly. Motion of his friends for exclusion of non-qualified persons 475

Intense exasperation of the returned exiles against Phokion—grounds for that feeling 476

Phokion is condemned to death—vindictive manifestation against him in the assembly, furious and unanimous..... 477

Death of Phokion and his four colleagues 479

Alteration of the sentiment of the Athenians towards Phokion, not long afterwards. Honours shown to his memory..... 481

Explanation of this alteration. Kassander gets possession of Athens, and restores the oligarchical or Phokionic party ..... *ib.*

Life and character of Phokion..... 482

War between Polysperchon and Kassander, in Attica and Peloponnesus. Polysperchon is repulsed in the siege of Megalopolis, and also defeated at sea 486

Increased strength of Kassander in Greece—he gets possession of Athens 487

Restoration of the oligarchical government at Athens, though in a mitigated form, under the Phalerean Demetrius 488

Administration of the Phalerean Demetrius at Athens, in a moderate spirit. Census taken of the Athenian population..... 489

Kassander in Peloponnesus—many cities join him—the Spartans surround their city with walls 492

Feud in the Macedonian imperial family—Olympias puts to death Philip Aridæus and Eurydikê—she reigns in Macedonia: her bloody revenge against the partisans of Antipater..... 493

Kassander passes into Macedonia—defeats Olympias, and becomes master of the country—Olympias is besieged in Pydna, captured, and put to death 494

Page

Great power of Antigonus in Asia. Confederacy of Kassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleukus against him 495
Kassander founds Kassandreia, and restores Thebes 496
Measures of Antigonus against Kassander—he promises freedom to the Grecian cities—Ptolemy promises the like. Great power of Kassander in Greece 498
Forces of Antigonus in Greece. Considerable success against Kassander 500
Pacification between the belligerents. Grecian autonomy guaranteed in name by all. Kassander puts to death Roxana and her child 501
Polysperchon espouses the pretensions of Herakles, son of Alexander, against Kassander. He enters into compact with Kassander, assassinates the young prince, and is recognized as ruler of Southern Greece 502
Assassination of Kleopatra, last surviving relative of Alexander the Great, by Antigonus 503
Ptolemy of Egypt in Greece—after some successes, he concludes a truce with Kassander. Passiveness of the Grecian cities 504
Sudden arrival of Demetrius Poliorketes in Peiræus. The Athenians declare in his favour. Demetrius Phalereus retires to Egypt. Capture of Munychia and Megara 505
Demetrius Poliorketes enters Athens in triumph. He promises restoration of the democracy. Extravagant votes of flattery passed by the Athenians towards him. Two new Athenian tribes created 506
Alteration of tone and sentiment in Athens, during the last thirty years 508
Contrast of Athens as proclaimed free by Demetrius Poliorketes, with Athens after the expulsion of Hippias 510
Opposition made by Demochares, nephew of Demosthenes, to these obsequious public flatteries 511
Demetrius Phalereus condemned in his absence. Honourable commemoration of the deceased orator Lykurgus ..... *ib.*
Restrictive law passed against the philosophers—they all leave Athens. The law is repealed next year, and the philosophers return to Athens 512
Exploits of Demetrius Poliorketes. His long siege of Rhodes. Gallant and successful resistance of the citizens 514
His prolonged war, and ultimate success in Greece, against Kassander 515
Return of Demetrius Poliorketes to Athens—his triumphant reception—memorable Ithyphallic hymn addressed to him 518

Page
Helpless condition of the Athenians—proclaimed by themselves... 519
Idolatry shown to Demetrius at Athens. He is initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, out of the regular season 520
March of Demetrius into Thessaly—he passes into Asia and joins Antigonus—great battle of Ipsus, in which the four confederates completely defeat Antigonus, who is slain, and his Asiatic power broken up and partitioned 522
Restoration of the Kassandrian dominion in Greece. Lachares makes himself despot at Athens, under Kassander. Demetrius Poliorketes returns, and expels Lachares. He garrisons Peiræus and Munychia 523
Death of Kassander. Bloody feuds among his family. Demetrius acquires the crown of Macedonia..... 525
Antigonus Gonatas (son of Demetrius) master of Macedonia and Greece. Permanent rule of the Antigonid dynasty in Macedonia, until the conquest of that country by the Romans 526
Spirit of the Greeks broken—isolation of the cities from each other by Antigonus..... *ib.*
The Greece of Polybius cannot form a subject of history by itself, but only as an appendage to foreign neighbours 528
Evidence of the political nullity of Athens—public decree in honour of Democharès—what acts are recorded as his titles to public gratitude..... 529

CHAPTER XCVII.

Sicilian and Italian Greeks—Agathokles.

Constitution established by Timoleon at Syracuse—afterwards exchanged for an oligarchy 531
Italian Greeks—pressed upon by enemies from the interior—Archidamus king of Sparta slain in Italy..... 532
Growth of the Molossian kingdom of Epirus, through Macedonian aid—Alexander the Molossian king, brother of Olympias..... 533
The Molossian Alexander crosses into Italy to assist the Tarentines. His exploits and death..... 534
Assistance sent by the Syracusans to Kroton—first rise of Agathokles 535
Agathokles distinguishes himself in the Syracusan expedition—he is disappointed of honours—becomes discontented and leaves Syracuse..... 537
He levies a mercenary force—his exploits as general in Italy and Sicily..... 538
Change of government at Syracuse—Agathokles is recalled—his exploits against the exiles—his dangerous character at home ... 539

Page
Farther internal changes at Syracuse—recall of the exiles—Agathokles re-admitted—swears amnesty and fidelity 540
Agathokles, in collusion with Hamilkar, arms his partisans at Syracuse, and perpetrates a sanguinary massacre of the citizens ... 541
Agathokles is constituted sole despot of Syracuse 543
His popular manners, military energy, and conquests 544
Progress of Agathokles in conquering Sicily. The Agrigentines take alarm and organize a defensive alliance against him 545
They invite the Spartan Akrotatus to command—his bad conduct and failure 546
Sicily the only place in which a glorious Hellenic career was open. 547
Peace concluded by Agathokles with the Agrigentines—his great power in Sicily 548
He is repulsed from Agrigentum—the Carthaginians send an armament to Sicily against him 549
Position of the Carthaginians between Gela and Agrigentum—their army reinforced from home 550
Operations of Agathokles against them—his massacre of citizens at Gela ..... *ib.*
Battle of the Himera, between Agathokles and the Carthaginians 551
Total defeat of Agathokles by the Carthaginians 552
The Carthaginians recover a large part of Sicily from Agathokles. His depressed condition at Syracuse 553
He conceives the plan of attacking the Carthaginians in Africa ... 554
His energy and sagacity in organizing this expedition. His renewed massacre and spoliation 555
He gets out of the harbour, in spite of the blockading fleet. Eclipse of the sun. He reaches Africa safely 556
He burns his vessels—impressive ceremony for effecting this, under vow to Demeter 557
Agathokles marches into the Carthaginian territory—captures Tunes—richness and cultivation of the country 558
Consternation at Carthage—the city-force marches out against him—Hanno and Bomilkar named generals 561
Inferior numbers of Agathokles—his artifices to encourage the soldiers 563
Treachery of the Carthaginian general Bomilkar—victory of Agathokles ..... *ib.*
Conquests of Agathokles among the Carthaginian dependencies on the eastern coast 564
Religious terror and distress of the Carthaginians. Human sacrifice. 565
Operations of Agathokles on the eastern coast of Carthage—capture of Neapolis, Adrumetum, Thapsus, &c. 567

Page
Agathokles fortifies Aspis—undertakes operations against the interior country—defeats the Carthaginians again 569
Proceedings of Hamilkar before Syracuse—the city is near surrendering—he is disappointed, and marches away from it 570
Renewed attack of Hamilkar upon Syracuse—he tries to surprise Eurýalus, but is totally defeated, made prisoner, and slain 572
The Agrigentines stand forward as champions of Sicilian freedom against Agathokles and the Carthaginians 574
Mutiny in the army of Agathokles at Tunês—his great danger, and address in extricating himself 575
Carthaginian army sent to act in the interior—attacked by Agathokles with some success—his camp is pillaged by the Numidians 577
Agathokles invites the aid of Ophellas from Kyrênê ..... *ib.*
Antecedent circumstances of Kyrênê. Division of coast between Kyrênê and Carthage 578
Thimbron with the Harpalian mercenaries is invited over to Kyrênê by exiles. His chequered career, on the whole victorious, in Libya 580
The Kyrenæans solicit aid from the Egyptian Ptolemy, who sends Ophellas thither. Defeat and death of Thimbron. Kyrenaica annexed to the dominions of Ptolemy, under Ophellas as viceroy. 582
Position and hopes of Ophellas. He accepts the invitation of Agathokles. He collects colonists from Athens and other Grecian cities 583
March of Ophellas, with his army, and his colonists, from Kyrênê to the Carthaginian territory—sufferings endured in the march . 586
Perfidy of Agathokles—he kills Ophellas—gets possession of his army—ruin and dispersion of the colonists 587
Terrible sedition at Carthage—Bomilkar tries to seize the supreme power—he is overthrown and slain 588
Farther successes of Agathokles in Africa—he captures Utica, Hippo-Zarytus, and Hippagreta 589
Agathokles goes to Sicily, leaving Archagathus to command in Africa. Successes of Archagathus in the interior country 592
Redoubled efforts of the Carthaginians—they gain two great victories over Archagathus ..... *ib.*
Danger of Archagathus—he is blocked up by the Carthaginians at Tunis 593
Agathokles in Sicily. His career at first prosperous. Defeat of the Agrigentines 594
Activity of Agathokles in Sicily—Deinokrates in great force against him 595

Page
Agrigentine army under Xenodokus—opposed to the mercenaries of Agathokles—superiority of the latter 596
Defeat of Xenodokus by Leptines—Agathokles passes over into Africa—bad state of his army there—he is defeated by the Carthaginians 597
Nocturnal panic and disorder in both camps 598
Desperate condition of Agathokles—he deserts his army and escapes to Sicily 599
The deserted army kill the two sons of Agathokles, and capitulate with the Carthaginians 600
African expedition of Agathokles—boldness of the first conception—imprudently pushed and persisted in 601
Proceedings of Agathokles in Sicily—his barbarities at Egesta and Syracuse 602
Great mercenary force under Deinokrates in Sicily—Agathokles solicits peace from him, and is refused—he concludes peace with Carthage 603
Battle of Torgium—victory of Agathokles over Deinokrates 604
Accommodation and compact between Agathokles and Deinokrates. 605
Operations of Agathokles in Liparæ, Italy, and Korkyra—Kleonymus of Sparta 606
Last projects of Agathokles—mutiny of his grandson Archagathus—sickness, poisoning, and death of Agathokles 607
Splendid genius of action and resource—nefarious dispositions—of Agathokles 609
Hellenic agency in Sicily continues during the life of Agathokles, but becomes then subordinate to preponderant foreigners 611

CHAPTER XCVIII.

Outlying Hellenic Cities.—1. In Gaul and Spain. 2. On the coast of the Euxine.

Massalia—its situation and circumstances 613
Colonies planted by Massalia—Antipolis, Nikæa, Rhoda, Emporiæ—peculiar circumstances of Emporiæ 616
Oligarchical government of Massalia—prudent political administration 617
Hellenising influence of Massalia in the West—Pytheas, the navigator and geographer 619
Pontic Greeks—Pentapolis on the south-west coast 620
Sinôpê—its envoys present with Darius in his last days—maintains

Page
its independence for some time against the Mithridatic princes—but becomes subject to them ultimately 621
The Pontic Herakleia—oligarchical government—the native Mariandyni reduced to serfs 622
Political discord at Herakleia—banishment of Klearchus—partial democracy established 624
Continued political troubles at Herakleia—assistance invoked from without 625
Character and circumstances of Klearchus—he makes himself despot of Herakleia—his tyranny and cruelty ..... *ib.*
He continues despot for twelve years—he is assassinated at a festival 627
Satyrus becomes despot—his aggravated cruelty—his military vigour 628
Despotism of Timotheus, just and mild—his energy and ability ... 629
Despotism of Dionysius—his popular and vigorous government—his prudent dealing with the Macedonians, during the absence of Alexander in the East 630
Return of Alexander to Susa—he is solicited by the Herakleotic exiles—danger of Dionysius, averted by the death of Alexander. 631
Prosperity and prudence of Dionysius—he marries Amastris—his favour with Antigonus—his death 633
Amastris governs Herakleia—marries Lysimachus—is divorced from him—Klearchus and Oxathres kill Amastris—are killed by Lysimachus 634
Arsinoê mistress of Herakleia. Defeat and death of Lysimachus. Power of Seleukus 635
Herakleia emancipated from the despots, and a popular government established—recall of the exiles—bold bearing of the citizens towards Seleukus—death of Seleukus 636
Situation and management of Herakleia as a free government—considerable naval power 637
Prudent administration of Herakleia, as a free city, among the powerful princes of Asia Minor—general condition and influence of the Greek cities on the coast 638
Grecian Pentapolis on the south-west of the Euxine—Ovid at Tomi. 639
Olbia—in the days of Herodotus and Ephorus—increased numbers, and multiplied inroads of the barbaric hordes 641
Olbia in later days—decline of security and production 644
Olbia pillaged and abandoned—afterwards renewed 646
Visit of Dion the Rhetor—Hellenic tastes and manners—ardent interest in Homer ..... *ib.*
Bosporus or Pantikapæum 648
Princes of Bosporus—relations between Athens and Bosporus ... *ib.*

Page

Nymphæum among the tributary cities under the Athenian empire —how it passed under the Bosporanic princes 650

Alliance and reciprocal good offices between the Bosporanic princes Satyrus, Leukon, &c. and the Athenians. Immunities of trade granted to the Athenians 651

Political condition of the Greeks of Bosporus—the princes called themselves archons—their empire over barbaric tribes 653

Family feuds among the Bosporanic princes—war between Satyrus and Eumelus—death of Satyrus II..... 654

Civil war between Prytanis and Eumelus—victory of Eumelus—he kills the wives, children, and friends, of his brother 656

His victorious reign and conquests—his speedy death ..... *ib.*

Decline of the Bosporanic dynasty, until it passed into the hands of Mithridates Eupator 658

Monuments left by the Spartokid princes of Bosporus—sepulchral tumuli near Kertch (Pantikapæum) ..... *ib.*

Appendix on the Localities near Issus 665

INDEX.—[The references are made to the later editions.] 671

Purchasers of Grote's Greece may obtain, on application to the Publisher, Appendix to Grote's Greece, Vols. I. & II.

HISTORY OF GREECE.

CHAPTER XCI.

FIRST PERIOD OF THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT—SIEGE AND CAPTURE OF THEBES.

MY last preceding volume ended with the assassination of Philip of Macedon, and the accession of his son Alexander the Great, then twenty years of age.

State of Greece at Alexander's accession—dependence on the Macedonian kings.

It demonstrates the altered complexion of Grecian history, that we are now obliged to seek for marking events in the succession to the Macedonian crown, or in the ordinances of Macedonian kings. In fact, the Hellenic world has ceased to be autonomous. In Sicily, indeed, the free and constitutional march, revived by Timoleon, is still destined to continue for a few years longer; but all the Grecian cities south of Mount Olympus have descended into dependents of Macedonia. Such dependence, established as a fact by the battle of Chæroneia and by the subsequent victorious march of Philip over Peloponnesus, was acknowledged in form by the vote of the Grecian

synod at Corinth. While even the Athenians had been compelled to concur in submission, Sparta alone, braving all consequences, continued inflexible in her refusal. The adherence of Thebes was not trusted to the word of the Thebans, but ensured by the Macedonian garrison established in her citadel, called the Kadmeia. Each Hellenic city, small and great,—maritime, inland, and insular—(with the single exception of Sparta), was thus enrolled as a separate unit in the list of subject-allies attached to the imperial headship of Philip.

Unwilling subjection of the Greeks—influence of Grecian intelligence on Macedonia.

Under these circumstances, the history of conquered Greece loses its separate course, and becomes merged in that of conquering Macedonia. Nevertheless, there are particular reasons which constrain the historian of Greece to carry on the two together for a few years longer. First, conquered Greece exercised a powerful action on her conqueror—"Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit." The Macedonians, though speaking a language of their own, had neither language for communicating with others, nor literature, nor philosophy, except Grecian and derived from Greeks. Philip, while causing himself to be chosen chief of Hellas, was himself not only partially hellenised, but an eager candidate for Hellenic admiration. He demanded the headship under the declared pretence of satisfying the old antipathy against Persia. Next, the conquests of Alexander, though essentially Macedonian, operated indirectly as the initiatory step of a series of events, diffusing Hellenic language (with some tinge of Hellenic literature) over a large breadth of Asia,—opening hat territory to the better observation,

in some degree even to the superintendence, of intelligent Greeks—and thus producing consequences important in many ways to the history of mankind. Lastly, the generation of free Greeks upon whom the battle of Chæroneia fell, were not disposed to lie quiet if any opportunity occurred for shaking off their Macedonian masters. The present volume will record the unavailing efforts made for this purpose, in which Demosthenes and most of the other leaders perished.

Basis of Alexander's character—not Hellenic.

Alexander (born in July 356 B.C.), like his father Philip, was not a Greek, but a Macedonian and Epirot, partially imbued with Grecian sentiment and intelligence. It is true that his ancestors, some centuries before, had been emigrants from Argos; but the kings of Macedonia had long lost all trace of any such peculiarity as might originally have distinguished them from their subjects. The basis of Philip's character was Macedonian, not Greek: it was the self-will of a barbarian prince, not the *ingenium civile*, or sense of reciprocal obligation and right in society with others, which marked more or less even the most powerful members of a Grecian city, whether oligarchical or democratical. If this was true of Philip, it was still more true of Alexander, who inherited the violent temperament and headstrong will of his furious Epirotic mother Olympias.

Boyhood and education of Alexander.

A kinsman of Olympias, named Leonidas, and an Akarnanian named Lysimachus, are mentioned as the chief tutors to whom Alexander's childhood was entrusted[1]. Of course the Iliad of Homer was

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. c. 5, 6.

among the first things which he learnt as a boy. Throughout most of his life, he retained a passionate interest in this poem, a copy of which, said to have been corrected by Aristotle, he carried with him in his military campaigns. We are not told, nor is it probable, that he felt any similar attachment for the less warlike Odyssey. Even as a child, he learnt to identify himself in sympathy with Achilles,—his ancestor by the mother's side, according to the Æakid pedigree. The tutor Lysimachus won his heart by calling himself Phœnix—Alexander, Achilles—and Philip, by the name of Peleus. Of Alexander's boyish poetical recitations, one anecdote remains, both curious and of unquestionable authenticity. He was ten years old, when the Athenian legation, including both Æschines and Demosthenes, came to Pella to treat about peace. While Philip entertained them at table, in his usual agreeable and convivial manner, the boy Alexander recited for their amusement certain passages of poetry which he had learnt—and delivered, in response with another boy, a dialogue out of one of the Grecian dramas[1].

He receives instruction from Aristotle.

At the age of thirteen, Alexander was placed under the instruction of Aristotle, whom Philip expressly invited for the purpose, and whose father Nikomachus had been both friend and physician of Philip's father Amyntas. What course of study Alexander was made to go through, we unfortunately cannot state. He enjoyed the teaching of Aristotle for at least three years, and we are told that he devoted himself to it with ardour, con-

[1] Æschines cont. Timarch. p. 167.

tracting a strong attachment to his preceptor. His powers of addressing an audience, though not so well attested as those of his father, were always found sufficient for his purpose: moreover, he retained, even in the midst of his fatiguing Asiatic campaigns, an interest in Greek literature and poetry.

Early political action and maturity of Alexander—his quarrels with his father. Family discord.

At what precise moment, during the lifetime of his father, Alexander first took part in active service, we do not know. It is said that once, when quite a youth, he received some Persian envoys during the absence of his father; and that he surprised them by the maturity of his demeanour, as well as by the political bearing and pertinence of his questions[1]. Though only sixteen years of age, in 340 B.C. he was left at home as regent while Philip was engaged in the sieges of Byzantium and Perinthus. He put down a revolt of the neighbouring Thracian tribe called Mædi, took one of their towns, and founded it anew under the title of Alexandria; the earliest town which bore that name, afterwards applied to so many other towns planted by him. In the march of Philip into Greece (338 B.C.), Alexander took part, commanded one of the wings at the battle of Chæroneia, and is said to have first gained the advantage on his side over the Theban sacred band[2].

Yet notwithstanding such marks of confidence and cooperation, other incidents occurred producing bitter animosity between the father and the son. By his wife Olympias, Philip had as offspring

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 5.

[2] Plutarch, Alex. 9. Justin says that Alexander was the companion of his father during part of the war in Thrace (ix. 1).

Alexander and Kleopatra: by a Thessalian mistress named Philinna, he had a son named Aridæus (afterwards called Philip Aridæus): he had also daughters named Kynna (or Kynanê) and Thessalonikê. Olympias, a woman of sanguinary and implacable disposition, had rendered herself so odious to him, that he repudiated her, and married a new wife named Kleopatra. I have recounted in the preceding volume[1] the indignation felt by Alexander at this proceeding, and the violent altercation which occurred during the conviviality of the marriage banquet; where Philip actually snatched his sword, threatened his son's life, and was only prevented from executing the threat by falling down through intoxication. After this quarrel, Alexander retired from Macedonia, conducting his mother to her brother Alexander king of Epirus. A son was born to Philip by Kleopatra. Her brother or uncle Attalus acquired high favour. Her kinsmen and partisans generally were also promoted, while Ptolemy, Nearchus, and other persons attached to Alexander, were banished[2].

Uncertainty of Alexander's position during the last year of Philip.

The prospects of Alexander were thus full of uncertainty and peril, up to the very day of Philip's assassination. The succession to the Macedonian crown, though transmitted in the same family, was by no means assured as to individual members; moreover, in the regal house of Macedonia[3] (as

[1] Vol. XI. Ch. xc. p. 78. [2] Plutarch, Alex. 10. Arrian, iii. 6, 8.

[3] See the third chapter of Plutarch's life of Demetrius Poliorkêtês; which presents a vivid description of the feelings prevalent between members of regal families in those ages. Demetrius, coming home from the chase with his hunting javelins in his hand, goes up to his father Antigonus, salutes him, and sits down by his side without disarming.

among the kings called Diadochi, who acquired dominion after the death of Alexander the Great), violent feuds and standing mistrust between father, sons, and brethren, were ordinary phænomena, to which the family of the Antigonids formed an honourable exception. Between Alexander and Olympias on the one side, and Kleopatra with her son and Attalus on the other, a murderous contest was sure to arise. Kleopatra was at this time in the ascendent; Olympias was violent and mischievous; and Philip was only forty-seven years of age. Hence the future threatened nothing but aggravated dissension and difficulties for Alexander. Moreover his strong will and imperious temper, eminently suitable for supreme command, disqualified him from playing a subordinate part, even to his own father. The prudence of Philip, when

This is extolled as an unparalleled proof of the confidence and affection subsisting between the father and the son. In the families of all the other Diadochi (says Plutarch) murders of sons, mothers, and wives, were frequent—murders of brothers were even common, assumed to be precautions necessary for security. Οὕτως ἄρα πάντη δυσκωνοίνητον ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ μεστὸν ἀπιστίας καὶ δυσνοίας, ὥστε ἀγάλλεσθαι τὸν μέγιστον τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου διαδόχων καὶ πρεσβύτατον, ὅτι μὴ φοβεῖται τὸν υἱόν, ἀλλὰ προσίεται τὴν λύγχην ἔχοντα τοῦ σώματος πλήσιον. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ μόνος, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ὁ οἶκος οὗτος ἐπὶ πλείστας διαδοχὰς τῶν τοιούτων κακῶν ἐκαθάρευσε, μᾶλλον δὲ εἷς μόνος τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιγόνου Φίλιππος ἀνεῖλεν υἱόν. Αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι σχεδὸν ἁπᾶσαι διαδοχαὶ πολλῶν μὲν ἔχουσι παίδων, πολλῶν δὲ μητέρων φόνους· καὶ γυναικῶν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀδελφοὺς ἀναιρεῖν, ὥσπερ οἱ γεωμέτραι τὰ αἰτήματα λαμβάνουσιν, οὕτω συνεχωρεῖτο κοινόν τι νομιζόμενον αἴτημα καὶ βασιλικὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας.

Compare Tacitus, Histor. v. 8, about the family feuds of the kings of Judæa; and Xenoph. Hieron. iii. 8.

In noticing the Antigonid family as a favourable exception, we must confine our assertion to the first century of that family. The bloody tragedy of Perseus and Demetrius shortly preceded the ruin of the empire.

about to depart on his Asiatic expedition, induced him to attempt to heal these family dissensions by giving his daughter Kleopatra in marriage to her uncle Alexander of Epirus, brother of Olympias. It was during the splendid marriage festival, then celebrated at Ægæ, that he was assassinated—Olympias, Kleopatra, and Alexander, being all present, while Attalus was in Asia, commanding the Macedonian division sent forward in advance, jointly with Parmenio. Had Philip escaped this catastrophe, he would doubtless have carried on the war in Asia Minor with quite as much energy and skill as it was afterwards prosecuted by Alexander: though we may doubt whether the father would have stretched out to those ulterior undertakings which, gigantic and far-reaching as they were, fell short of the insatiable ambition of the son. But successful as Philip might have been in Asia, he would hardly have escaped gloomy family feuds; with Alexander as a mutinous son, under the instigations of Olympias,—and with Kleopatra on the other side, feeling that her own safety depended upon the removal of regal or quasi-regal competitors.

Impression produced by the sudden death of Philip.

From such formidable perils, visible in the distance, if not immediately impending, the sword of Pausanias guaranteed both Alexander and the Macedonian kingdom. But at the moment when the blow was struck, and when the Lynkestian Alexander, one of those privy to it, ran to forestall resistance and place the crown on the head of Alexander the Great[1]—no one knew what to expect from the young prince thus suddenly exalted at

[1] Arrian, i. 25, 2; Justin, xi. 2. See Vol. XI. p. 714.

the age of twenty years. The sudden death of Philip in the fulness of glory and ambitious hopes, must have produced the strongest impression, first upon the festive crowd assembled,—next throughout Macedonia,—lastly, upon the foreigners whom he had reduced to dependence, from the Danube to the borders of Pæonia. All these dependencies were held only by the fear of Macedonian force. It remained to be proved whether the youthful son of Philip was capable of putting down opposition and upholding the powerful organisation created by his father. Moreover Perdikkas, the elder brother and predecessor of Philip, had left a son named Amyntas, now at least twenty-four years of age, to whom many looked as the proper successor[1].

Accession of Alexander—his energy and judgement.

But Alexander, present and proclaimed at once by his friends, showed himself both in word and deed, perfectly competent to the emergency. He mustered, caressed, and conciliated, the divisions of the Macedonian army and the chief officers. His addresses were judicious and energetic, engaging that the dignity of the kingdom should be maintained unimpaired[2], and that even the Asiatic projects already proclaimed should be prosecuted with as much vigour as if Philip still lived.

Accomplices of Pausanias are slain by Alexander—Amyntas and others are slain by him also.

It was one of the first measures of Alexander to celebrate with magnificent solemnities the funeral of his deceased father. While the preparations for it were going on, he instituted researches to find

[1] Arrian, De Rebus post Alexandrum, Fragm. ap. Photium, cod. 92. p. 220; Plutarch, De Fortunâ Alex. Magn. p. 327. *πᾶσα δὲ ὑπουλος ἦν ἡ Μακεδονία* (after the death of Philip) *πρὸς Ἀμύνταν ἀποβλέπουσα καὶ τοὺς Ἀερόπου παῖδας.*

[2] Diod. xvii. 2.

out and punish the accomplices of Pausanias.* Of these indeed, the most illustrious person mentioned to us—Olympias—was not only protected by her position from punishment, but retained great ascendency over her son to the end of his life. Three other persons are mentioned by name as accomplices—brothers and persons of good family from the district of Upper Macedonia called Lynkêstis—Alexander, Heromenes, and Arrhabæus, sons of Aëropus. The two latter were put to death, but the first of the three was spared, and even promoted to important charges, as a reward for his useful forwardness in instantly saluting Alexander king[1]. Others also, we know not how many, were executed; and Alexander seems to have imagined that there still remained some undetected[2]. The Persian king boasted in public letters[3], with how much truth we cannot say, that he too had been among the instigators of Pausanias.

Among the persons slain about this time by Alexander, we may number his first-cousin and brother-in-law Amyntas—son of Perdikkas (the elder brother of the deceased Philip); Amyntas was a boy when his father Perdikkas died. Though having a preferable claim to the succession, according to usage, he had been put aside by his uncle Philip, on the ground of his age and of the strenuous efforts required on commencing a new reign. Philip had

[1] Arrian, i. 25, 2; Curtius, vii. 1, 6. Alexander son of Aëropus was son-in-law of Antipater. The case of this Alexander—and of Olympias—afforded a certain basis to those who said (Curtius, vi. 43) that Alexander had dealt favourably with the accomplices of Pausanias.

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 10-27; Diodor. xvii. 51; Justin, xi. 11.

[3] Arrian, ii. 14, 10.

however given in marriage to this Amyntas his daughter (by an Illyrian mother) Kynna. Nevertheless, Alexander now put him to death[1], on accusation of conspiracy: under what precise circumstances, does not appear—but probably Amyntas (who besides being the son of Philip's elder brother, was at least twenty-four years of age, while Alexander was only twenty) conceived himself as having a better right to the succession, and was so conceived by many others. The infant son of Kleopatra by Philip is said to have been killed by Alexander, as a rival in the succession; Kleopatra herself was afterwards put to death by Olympias during his absence, and to his regret. Attalus, also, uncle of Kleopatra and joint commander of the Macedonian army in Asia, was assassinated under the private orders of Alexander, by Hekatæus and Philotas[2]. Another Amyntas, son of Antiochus (there seem to have been several Mace-

[1] Curtius, vi. 9, 17. vi. 10, 24. Arrian mentioned this Amyntas son of Perdikkas (as well as the fact of his having been put to death by Alexander before the Asiatic expedition), in the lost work τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον—see Photius Cod. 92. p. 220. But Arrian, in his account of Alexander's expedition, *does not mention* the fact; which shows that his silence is not to be assumed as a conclusive reason for discrediting allegations of others.

Compare Polyænus, viii. 60; and Plutarch, Fort. Alex. Magn. p. 327.

It was during his expedition into Thrace and Illyria, about eight months after his accession, that Alexander promised to give his sister Kynnà in marriage to Langarus prince of the Agrianes (Arrian, Exp. Al. M. i. 5, 7). Langarus died of sickness soon after; so that this marriage never took place. But when the promise was made, Kynna must have been a widow. Her husband Amyntas must therefore have been put to death during the first months of Alexander's reign.

[2] See my last preceding volume, Chap. xc. p. 715; Diod. xvii. 2; Curtius, vii. 1, 6; Justin, ix. 7. xi. 2. xii. 6; Plutarch, Alexand. 10; Pausanias, viii. 7, 5.

donians named Amyntas) fled for safety into Asia[1]: probably others, who felt themselves to be objects of suspicion, did the like—since by the Macedonian custom, not merely a person convicted of high treason, but all his kindred along with him, were put to death[2].

Sentiment at Athens on the death of Philip—language of Demosthenes—inclination to resist Macedonia, but no overt act.

By unequivocal manifestations of energy and address, and by despatching rivals or dangerous malcontents, Alexander thus speedily fortified his position on the throne at home. But from the foreign dependents of Macedonia—Greeks, Thracians, and Illyrians—the like acknowledgment was not so easily obtained. Most of them were disposed to throw off the yoke; yet none dared to take the initiative of moving, and the suddenness of Philip's death found them altogether unprepared for combination. By that event the Greeks were discharged from all engagement, since the vote of the confederacy had elected him personally as Imperator. They were now at liberty, in so far as there was any liberty at all in the proceeding, to elect any one else, or to abstain from re-electing at all, and even to let the confederacy expire. Now it was only under constraint and intimidation, as was well known both in Greece and in Macedonia, that they had conferred this dignity even on Philip—who had earned it by splendid exploits, and had proved himself the ablest captain and politician of the age. They were by no means inclined to transfer it to a youth like Alexander, until he had shown himself capable of

[1] Arrian, i. 17, 10; Plutarch, Alex. 20; Curtius, iii. 28, 18.

[2] Curtius, vi. 42, 20. Compare with this custom, a passage in the Ajax of Sophokles, v. 725.

bringing the like coercion to bear, and extorting the same submission. The wish to break loose from Macedonia, widely spread throughout the Grecian cities, found open expression from Demosthenes and others in the assembly at Athens. That orator (if we are to believe his rival Æschines), having received private intelligence of the assassination of Philip, through certain spies of Charidemus, before it was publicly known to others—pretended to have had it revealed to him in a dream by the Gods. Appearing in the assembly with his gayest attire, he congratulated his countrymen on the death of their greatest enemy, and pronounced high encomiums on the brave tyrannicide of Pausanias, which he would probably compare to that of Harmodius and Aristogeiton[1]. He depreciated the abilities of Alexander, calling him Margites (the name of a silly character in one of the Homeric poems), and intimating that he would be too much distracted with embarrassments and ceremonial duties at home, to have leisure for a foreign march[2]. Such, according to Æschines, was the language of Demosthenes on the first news of Philip's death. We cannot doubt that the public of Athens, as well as Demosthenes, felt great joy at an event which seemed to open to them fresh chances of freedom, and that the motion for a sacrifice of thanksgiving[3], in spite of Phokion's opposition, was readily adopted. But though the manifestation of sentiment at Athens was thus anti-

[1] Æschines adv. Ktesiphont. c. 29. p. 469; c. 78. p. 603; Plutarch, Demosth. 22.

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 547. c. 50.

[3] Plutarch, Phokion, 16.

Macedonian, exhibiting aversion to the renewal of that obedience which had been recently promised to Philip, Demosthenes did not go so far as to declare any positive hostility[1]. He tried to open communication with the Persians in Asia Minor, and also, if we may believe Diodorus, with the Macedonian commander in Asia Minor, Attalus. But neither of the two missions was successful. Attalus sent his letter to Alexander; while the Persian king[2], probably relieved by the death of Philip from immediate fear of the Macedonian power, despatched a peremptory refusal to Athens, intimating that he would furnish no more money[3].

B.C. 336, autumn. Discontent in Greece—but no positive movement.

Not merely in Athens, but in other Grecian states also, the death of Philip excited aspirations for freedom. The Lacedæmonians, who, though unsupported, had stood out inflexibly against any obedience to him, were now on the watch for new allies; while the Arcadians, Argeians, and Eleians, manifested sentiments adverse to Macedonia. The Ambrakiots expelled the garrison placed by Philip in their city; the Ætolians passed a vote to assist in restoring those Akarnanian exiles whom he had banished[4]. On the other hand, the Thessalians

[1] We gather this from Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 551. c. 52.

[2] Diodorus (xvii. 5) mentions this communication of Demosthenes to Attalus; which, however, I cannot but think improbable. Probably Charidemus was the organ of the communications.

[3] This letter from Darius is distinctly alluded to, and even a sentence cited from it, by Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 633, 634. c. 88. We know that Darius wrote in very different language not long afterwards, near the time when Alexander crossed into Asia (Arrian, ii. 14, 11). The first letter must have been sent shortly after Philip's death, when Darius was publicly boasting of having procured the deed, and before he had yet learnt to fear Alexander. Compare Diodor. xvii. 7.

[4] Diodor. xvii. 3.

manifested unshaken adherence to Macedonia. But the Macedonian garrison at Thebes, and the macedonising Thebans who now governed that city[1], were probably the main obstacles to any combined manifestation in favour of Hellenic autonomy.

B.C. 336, October. March of Alexander into Greece —submission of Athens.

Apprised of these impulses prevalent throughout the Grecian world, Alexander felt the necessity of checking them by a demonstration immediate, as well as intimidating. The energy and rapidity of his proceedings speedily overawed all those who had speculated on his youth, or had adopted the epithets applied to him by Demosthenes. Having surmounted, in a shorter time than was supposed possible, the difficulties of his newly-acquired position at home, he marched into Greece at the head of a formidable army, seemingly about two months after the death of Philip. He was favourably received by the Thessalians, who passed a vote constituting Alexander head of Greece in place of his father Philip; which vote was speedily confirmed by the Amphiktyonic assembly, convoked at Thermopylæ. Alexander next advanced to Thebes, and from thence over the isthmus of Corinth into Peloponnesus. The details of his march we do not know; but his great force, probably not inferior to that which had conquered at Chæroneia, spread terror everywhere, silencing all except his partisans. No-

[1] Diodorus (xvii. 3) says that the Thebans passed a vote to expel the Macedonian garrison in the Kadmeia. But I have little hesitation in rejecting this statement. We may be sure that the presence of the Macedonian garrison was connected with the predominance in the city of a party favourable to Macedonia. In the ensuing year, when the resistance really occurred, this was done by the anti-Macedonian party, who then got back from exile.

where was the alarm greater than at Athens. The Athenians, recollecting both the speeches of their orators and the votes of their assembly,—offensive at least, if not hostile, to the Macedonians—trembled lest the march of Alexander should be directed against their city, and accordingly made preparation for standing a siege. All citizens were enjoined to bring in their families and properties from the country, insomuch that the space within the walls was full both of fugitives and of cattle[1]. At the same time, the assembly adopted, on the motion of Demades, a resolution of apology and full submission to Alexander: they not only recognised him as chief of Greece, but conferred upon him divine honours, in terms even more emphatic than those bestowed on Philip[2]. The mover, with other legates, carried the resolution to Alexander, whom they found at Thebes, and who accepted their submission. A young speaker named Pytheas is said to have opposed the vote in the Athenian assembly[3]. Whether Demosthenes did the like—or whether, under the feeling of disappointed anticipations and overwhelming Macedonian force, he condemned himself to silence,—we cannot say. That he did not go with Demades on the mission to Alexander, seems a matter of course, though he is said to have been appointed by public vote to do so, and to have declined the duty. He accompanied the legation as far as Mount Kithæron, on the frontier, and then returned to Athens[4]. We read with astonishment

[1] Demadis Fragment. ὑπὲρ τῆς δωδεκαετίας, p. 180.
[2] Arrian, i. 1, 4. [3] Plutarch, Reipub. Ger. Præcept. p. 804.
[4] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 564. c. 50; Deinarchus cont. Demosth.

that Æschines and his other enemies denounced this step as a cowardly desertion. No envoy could be so odious to Alexander, or so likely to provoke refusal for the proposition which he carried, as Demosthenes. To employ him in such a mission would have been absurd; except for the purpose probably intended by his enemies, that he might be either detained by the conqueror as an expiatory victim[1], or sent back as a pardoned and humiliated prisoner.

B.C. 336, autumn. Alexander is chosen Imperator of the Greeks in the convention at Corinth—continued refusal of concurrence by Sparta.

After displaying his force in various portions of Peloponnesus, Alexander returned to Corinth, where he convened deputies from the Grecian cities generally. The list of those cities which obeyed the summons is not before us, but probably it included nearly all the cities of Central Greece. We know only that the Lacedæmonians continued to stand aloof, refusing all concurrence. Alexander asked from the assembled deputies the same appointment which the victorious Philip had required and obtained two years before—the hegemony or headship of the Greeks collectively for the purpose of prosecuting war against Persia[2]. To the request of a prince at the head of an irresistible army, one

p. 57; Diodor. xvii. 4; Plutarch, Demosth. c. 23 (Plutarch confounds the proceedings of this year with those of the succeeding year). Demades, in the fragment of his oration remaining to us, makes no allusion to this proceeding of Demosthenes.

The decree, naming Demosthenes among the envoys, is likely enough to have been passed chiefly by the votes of his enemies. It was always open to an Athenian citizen to accept or decline such an appointment.

[1] Several years afterwards, Demades himself was put to death by Antipater, to whom he had been sent as envoy from Athens (Diodor. xviii. 48).

[2] Arrian, i. 1, 2. *αἰτεῖν παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς Πέρσας*

answer only was admissible. He was nominated Imperator with full powers, by land and sea. Overawed by the presence and sentiment of Macedonian force, all acquiesced in this vote except the Lacedæmonians.

Conditions of the vote thus passed —privileges guaranteed to the cities.

The convention sanctioned by Alexander was probably the same as that settled by and with his father Philip. Its grand and significant feature was, that it recognised Hellas as a confederacy under the Macedonian prince as imperator, president, or executive head and arm. It crowned him with a legal sanction as keeper of the peace within Greece, and conqueror abroad in the name of Greece. Of its other conditions, some are made known to us by subsequent complaints; such conditions as, being equitable and tutelary towards the members generally, the Macedonian chief found it inconvenient to observe, and speedily began to violate. Each Hellenic city was pronounced, by the first article of the convention, to be free and autonomous. In each, the existing political constitution was recognised as it stood; all other cities were forbidden to interfere with it, or to second any attack by its hostile exiles[1]. No new despot was to be established;

στρατείας, ἥντινα Φιλίππῳ ἤδη ἔδοσαν· καὶ αἰτήσαντα λαβεῖν παρὰ πάντων, πλὴν Λακεδαιμονίων, &c.

Arrian speaks as if this request had been addressed only to the Greeks *within* Peloponnesus; moreover he mentions no assembly at Corinth, which is noticed (though with some confusion) by Diodorus, Justin, and Plutarch. Cities out of Peloponnesus, as well as within it, must have been included; unless we suppose that the resolution of the Amphiktyonic assembly, which had been previously passed, was held to comprehend all the extra-Peloponnesian cities, which seems not probable.

[1] Demosthenes (or Pseudo-Demosthenes), Orat. xvii. De Fœdere Alexandrino, p. 213, 214. ἐπιτάττει ἡ συνθήκη εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἐλευθέρους

no dispossessed despot was to be restored[1]. Each city became bound to discourage in every other, as far as possible, all illegal violence—such as political executions, confiscation, spoliation, re-division of land or abolition of debts, factious manumission of slaves, &c.[2] To each was guaranteed freedom of navigation; maritime capture was prohibited, on pain of enmity from all[3]. Each was forbidden to send armed vessels into the harbour of any other, or to build vessels or engage seamen there[4]. By each, an oath was taken to observe these conditions, to declare war against all who violated them, and to keep them inscribed on a commemorative column. Provision seems to have been made for admitting any additional city[5] on its subsequent application, though it might not have been a party to the original contract. Moreover, it appears that a standing military force, under Macedonian orders,

εἶναι καὶ αὐτονόμους τοὺς Ἕλληνας—Ἐστὶ γὰρ γεγραμμένον, ἐάν τινες τὰς πολιτείας τὰς παρ' ἑκάστοις οὔσας, ὅτε τοὺς ὅρκους τοὺς περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης ὤμνυσαν, καταλύσωσι, πολεμίους εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς τῆς εἰρήνης μετέχουσιν...

[1] Demosthen. Orat. de Fœdere Alex. p. 213.

[2] Demosth. ib. p. 215.

[3] Demosth. ib. p. 217. ἐστὶ γὰρ δήπου ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις, τὴν θάλατταν πλεῖν τοὺς μετέχοντας τῆς εἰρήνης, καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν αὐτοὺς μηδὲ κατάγειν πλοῖον μηδενὸς τούτων· ἐὰν δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιῇ, πολέμιον εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς τῆς εἰρήνης μετέχουσιν.....

[4] Demosth. ib. p. 218, 219. Böhnecke, in his instructive comments on this convention (Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Attischen Redner, p. 623), has treated the prohibition here mentioned as if it were one specially binding the Macedonians not to sail with armed ships into the Peiræus. This undoubtedly is the particular case on which the orator insists; but I conceive it to have been only a particular case under a general prohibitory rule.

[5] Arrian, ii. 1, 7; ii. 2, 4. Demosth. de Fœd. Alex. p. 213. Tenedos, Mitylênê, Antissa, and Eresus, can hardly have been members of the convention when first sworn.

was provided to enforce observance of the convention; and that the synod of deputies was contemplated as likely to meet periodically[1].

B.C. 336, autumn. Authority claimed by Alexander under the convention —degradation of the leading Grecian states.

Such was the convention, in so far as we know its terms, agreed to by the Grecian deputies at Corinth with Alexander; but with Alexander at the head of an irresistible army. He proclaimed it as the "public statute of the Greeks[2]," constituting a paramount obligation, of which he was the enforcer, binding on all, and authorising him to treat all transgressors as rebels. It was set forth as counterpart of, and substitute for, the convention of Antalkidas, which we shall presently see the officers of Darius trying to revive against him—the head-

[1] Demosth. Orat. de Fed. Alex. p. 215. *ἐστὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοὺς συνεδρεύοντας καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ φυλακῇ τεταγμένους, ὅπως ἐν ταῖς κοινωνούσαις πόλεσι μὴ γίγνωνται θάνατοι μηδὲ φυγαὶ παρὰ τοὺς κειμένους ταῖς πόλεσι νόμους..... Οἱ δὲ τοσοῦτον δέουσι τούτων τι κωλύειν, ὥστε καὶ συγκατασκευάζουσιν*, &c. (p. 216).

The persons designated by *οἱ δὲ*, and denounced throughout this oration generally, are, Alexander or the Macedonian officers and soldiers.

A passage in Deinarchus cont. Demosth. p. 14, leads to the supposition, that a standing Macedonian force was kept at Corinth, occupying the Isthmus. The Thebans, however, declared against Macedonia (in August or September 335 B.C.), and proceeding to besiege the Macedonian garrison in the Kadmeia, sent envoys to entreat aid from the Arcadians. "These envoys (says Deinarchus) got with difficulty by sea to the Arcadians"—*οἱ κατὰ θάλασσαν μόλις ἀφίκοντο πρὸς ἐκείνους*. Whence should this difficulty arise, except from a Macedonian occupation of Corinth?

[2] Arrian, i. 16, 10. *παρὰ τὰ κοινῇ δόξαντα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν*. After the death of Darius, Alexander pronounced that the Grecian mercenaries who had been serving with that prince, were highly criminal for having contravened the general vote of the Greeks (*παρὰ τὰ δόγματα τὰ Ἑλλήνων*), except such as had taken service before that vote was passed, and except the Sinopeans, whom Alexander considered as subjects of Persia and not partakers *τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων* (Arrian, iii. 23, 15; iii. 24, 8, 9).

ship of Persia against that of Macedonia. Such is the melancholy degradation of the Grecian world, that its cities have no alternative except to choose between these two foreign potentates—or to invite the help of Darius, the most distant and least dangerous, whose headship could hardly be more than nominal, against a neighbour sure to be domineering and compressive, and likely enough to be tyrannical. Of the once powerful Hellenic chiefs and competitors—Sparta, Athens, Thebes—under each of whom the Grecian world had been upheld as an independent and self-determining aggregate, admitting the free play of native sentiment and character, under circumstances more or less advantageous—the two last are now confounded as common units (one even held under garrison) among the subject allies of Alexander; while Sparta preserves only the dignity of an isolated independence.

B.C. 336–335, winter—spring.

Encroachments and tyranny of the Macedonian officers in Greece—complaints of the orators at Athens.

It appears that during the nine months which succeeded the swearing of the convention, Alexander and his officers (after his return to Macedonia) were active, both by armed force and by mission of envoys, in procuring new adhesions and in remodelling the governments of various cities suitably to their own views. Complaints of such aggressions were raised in the public assembly of Athens, the only place in Greece where any liberty of discussion still survived. An oration, pronounced by Demosthenes, Hyperides, or one of the contemporary anti-Macedonian politicians (about the spring or early summer of 335 B.C.)[1], imparts to us some idea both of the Macedonian interventions steadily

[1] This is the oration *περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον συνθηκῶν* already

going on, and of the unavailing remonstrances raised against them by individual Athenian citizens. At the time of this oration, such remonstrances had already been often repeated. They were always met by the macedonizing Athenians with peremptory declarations that the convention must be observed. But in reply, the remonstrants urged, that it was unfair to call upon Athens for strict observance of the convention, while the Macedonians and their partisans in the various cities were perpetually violating it for their own profit. Alexander and his officers (affirms this orator) had never once laid down their arms since the convention was settled. They had been perpetually tampering with the governments of the various cities, to promote their own partisans to power[1]. In Messênê, Sikyon, and Pellênê, they had subverted the popular constitutions, banished many citizens, and established friends of their own as despots. The Macedonian force, destined as a public guarantee to enforce the observance of the convention, had been employed only to overrule its best conditions, and to arm the hands of factious partisans[2]. Thus Alexander in

more than once alluded to above. Though standing among the Demosthenic works, it is supposed by Libanius as well as by most modern critics not to be the production of Demosthenes—upon internal grounds of style, which are certainly forcible. Libanius says that it bears much resemblance to the style of Hyperides. At any rate, there seems no reason to doubt that it is a genuine oration of one of the contemporary orators. I agree with Böhnecke (Forschungen, p. 629) in thinking that it must have been delivered a few months after the convention with Alexander, before the taking of Thebes.

[1] Demosthenes (or Pseudo-Demosth.), Orat. De Fœdere Alex. p. 216. Οὕτω μὲν τοίνυν ῥᾳδίως τὰ ὅπλα ἐπήνεγκε ὁ Μακεδὼν, ὥστε οὐδὲ κατέθετο πώποτε, ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν περιέρχεται καθ' ὅσον δύναται, &c.

[2] Demosth. ib. p. 214, 215.

his capacity of Imperator, disregarding all the restraints of the convention, acted as chief despot for the maintenance of subordinate despots in the separate cities[1]. Even at Athens, this imperial authority had rescinded sentences of the dikastery, and compelled the adoption of measures contrary to the laws and constitution[2].

Violations of the convention at sea by Macedonian officers.

At sea, the wrongful aggressions of Alexander or his officers had been not less manifest than on land. The convention, guaranteeing to all cities the right of free navigation, distinctly forbade each to take or detain vessels belonging to any other. Nevertheless the Macedonians had seized, in the Hellespont, all the merchantmen coming out with cargoes from the Euxine, and carried them into Tenedos, where they were detained, under various fraudulent pretences, in spite of remonstrances from the proprietors and cities whose supply of corn was thus intercepted. Among these sufferers, Athens stood conspicuous; since consumers of imported corn, ship-owners, and merchants, were more numerous there than elsewhere. The Athenians, addressing complaints and remonstrances without effect, became at length so incensed, and perhaps uneasy

[1] Demosth. (or Pseudo-Demosth.) Orat. De Fœdere Alex. p. 212, 214, 215, 220, where the orator speaks of Alexander as the τύραννος of Greece.

The orator argues (p. 213) that the Macedonians had recognised despotism as contrary to the convention, in so far as to expel the despots from the towns of Antissa and Eresus in Lesbos. But probably these despots were in correspondence with the Persians on the opposite mainland, or with Memnon.

[2] Demosth. ib. p. 215, τοὺς δ' ἰδίους ὑμῖν νόμους ἀναγκάζουσι λύειν, τοὺς μὲν κεκριμένους ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις ἀφιέντες, ἕτερα δὲ παμπλήθη τοιαῦτα βιαζόμενοι παρανομεῖν.....

about their provisions, that they passed a decree to equip and despatch 100 triremes, appointing Menestheus (son of Iphikrates) admiral. By this strenuous manifestation, the Macedonians were induced to release the detained vessels. Had the detention been prolonged, the Athenian fleet would have sailed to extort redress by force; so that, as Athens was more than a match for Macedon on sea, the maritime empire of the latter would have been overthrown, while even on land much encouragement would have been given to malcontents against it[1]. Another incident had occurred, less grave than this, yet still dwelt upon by the orator as an infringement of the convention, and as an insult to the Athenians. Though an express article of the convention prohibited armed ships of one city from entering the harbour of another, still a Macedonian trireme had been sent into Peiræus to ask permission that smaller vessels might be built there for Macedonian account. This was offensive to a large proportion of Athenians, not only as violating the convention, but as a mani-

[1] Demosth. (or Pseudo-Demosth.) Orat. De Fœdere Alex. p. 217. *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὑπεροψίας ἦλθον, ὥστε εἰς Τένεδον ἅπαντα τὰ ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου πλοῖα κατήγαγον, καὶ σκευωρούμενοι περὶ αὐτὰ οὐ πρότερον ἀφεῖσαν, πρὶν ὑμεῖς ἐψηφίσασθε τριήρεις ἑκατον πληροῦν καὶ καθέλκειν εὐθὺς τότε—ὃ παρ' ἐλάχιστον ἐπoίησεν αὐτοὺς ἀφαιρεθῆναι δικαίως τὴν κατὰ θάλασσαν ἡγεμονίαν.....* p. 218. *Ἕως γὰρ ἂν ἐξῇ τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ μόνοις ἀναμφισβητήτως εἶναι κυρίοις* (the Athenians), *τοῖς γε κατὰ γῆν πρὸς τῇ ὑπαρχούσῃ δυνάμει ἐστὶ προβολὰς ἑτέρας ἰσχυροτέρας εὑρέσθαι*, &c.

We know that Alexander caused a squadron of ships to sail round to and up the Danube from Byzantium (Arrian, i. 3, 3), to meet him after his march by land from the southern coast of Thrace. It is not improbable that the Athenian vessels detained may have come loaded with a supply of corn, and that the detention of the corn-ships may have been intended to facilitate this operation.

fest step towards employing the nautical equipments and seamen of Athens for the augmentation of the Macedonian navy[1].

Language of the complaining Athenians—they insist only on strict observance of the convention. Boldness of their language.

"Let those speakers who are perpetually admonishing us to observe the convention (the orator contends), prevail on the imperial chief to set the example of observing it on his part. I too impress upon you the like observance. To a democracy nothing is more essential than scrupulous regard to equity and justice[2]. But the convention itself enjoins all its members to make war against transgressors; and pursuant to this article, you ought to make war against Macedon[3]. Be assured that all Greeks will see that the war is neither directed against them nor brought on by your fault[4]. At this juncture, such a step for the maintenance of your own freedom as well as Hellenic freedom generally, will be not less opportune and advantageous than it is just[5]. The time is come for shaking off your disgraceful submission to others, and your oblivion of our own past dignity[6]. If you encou-

[1] Demosth. (or Pseudo-Demosth.) Orat. De Fœdere Alex. p. 219.

[2] Demosth. ib. p. 211. *οἶμαι γὰρ οὐδὲν οὕτω τοῖς δημοκρατουμένοις πρέπειν, ὡς περὶ τὸ ἴσον καὶ τὸ δίκαιον σπουδάζειν.*

I give here the main sense, without binding myself to the exact phrases.

[3] Demosth. ib. p. 213. *καὶ γὰρ ἔτι προσγέγραπται ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις, πολέμιον εἶναι, τὸν ἐκεῖνα ἅπερ Ἀλέξανδρος ποιοῦντα, ἁπᾶσι τοῖς τῆς εἰρήνης κοινωνοῦσι, καὶ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ, καὶ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἅπαντας.* Compare p. 214 init.

[4] Demosth. ib. p. 217. *οὐδεὶς ὑμῖν ἐγκαλέσει ποτε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὡς ἄρα παρέβητέ τι τῶν κοινῇ ὁμολογηθέντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ χάριν ἕξουσιν ὅτι μόνοι ἐξηλέγξατε τοὺς ταῦτα ποιοῦντας,* &c.

[5] Demosth. ib. p. 214. *νυνὶ δ', ὅτ' εἰς ταὐτὸ δίκαιον ἅμα καὶ ὁ καιρὸς καὶ τὸ σύμφερον συνδεδράμηκεν, ἄλλον ἄρα τινὰ χρόνον ἀναμενεῖτε τῆς ἰδίας ἐλευθερίας ἅμα καὶ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων ἀντιλαβέσθαι;*

[6] Demosth. ib. p. 220. *εἰ ἄρα ποτὲ δεῖ παύσασθαι αἰσχρῶς ἑτέροις*

rage me, I am prepared to make a formal motion—To declare war against the violators of the convention, as the convention itself directs[1]."

A formal motion for declaring war would have brought upon the mover a prosecution under the Graphê Paranomôn. Accordingly, though intimating clearly that he thought the actual juncture (what it was, we do not know) suitable, he declined to incur such responsibility without seeing beforehand a manifestation of public sentiment sufficient to give him hopes of a favourable verdict from the Dikastery. The motion was probably not made. But a speech so bold, even though not followed up by a motion, is in itself significant of the state of feeling in Greece during the months immediately following the Alexandrine convention. This harangue is only one among many delivered in the Athenian assembly, complaining of Macedonian supremacy as exercised under the convention. It is plain that the acts of Macedonian officers were such as to furnish ample ground for complaint; and the detention of all the trading ships coming out of the Euxine, shows us that even the subsistence of Athens and the islands had become more or less endangered. Though the Athenians resorted to no armed interference, their assembly at least afforded a theatre where public protest could be raised and public sympathy manifested.

It is probable too that at this time Demosthenes

ἀκολουθοῦντας, ἀλλὰ μηδ' ἀναμνησθῆναι μηδεμιᾶς φιλοτιμίας τῶν ἐξ ἀρχαιοτάτου καὶ πλείστου καὶ μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἡμῖν ὑπαρχουσῶν.

[1] Demosth. (or Pseudo-Demosth.) Orat. De Fœdere Alex. ἐὰν οὖν κελεύητε, γράψω, καθάπερ αἱ συνθῆκαι κελεύουσι, πολεμεῖν τοῖς παραβεβηκόσιν.

and the other anti-Macedonian speakers were encouraged by assurances and subsidies from Persia. Though the death of Philip, and the accession of an untried youth of twenty, had led Darius to believe for the moment that all danger of Asiatic invasion was past, yet his apprehensions were now revived by Alexander's manifested energy, and by the renewal of the Grecian league under his supremacy[1]. It was apparently during the spring of 335 B.C., that Darius sent money to sustain the anti-Macedonian party at Athens and elsewhere. Æschines affirms, and Deinarchus afterwards repeats (both of them orators hostile to Demosthenes)—That about this time, Darius sent to Athens 300 talents, which the Athenian people refused, but which Demosthenes took, reserving however 70 talents out of the sum for his own private purse: That public inquiry was afterwards instituted on the subject. Yet nothing is alleged as having been made out[2]; at least Demosthenes was neither condemned, nor even brought (as far as appears) to any formal trial. Out of such data we can elicit no specific fact. But they warrant the general conclusion, that Darius, or the satraps in Asia Minor, sent money to Athens in the spring

Encouragements held out by Persia to the Greeks.

[1] Diodorus, xvii. 7.

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 634; Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 11–19. p. 9–14. It is Æschines who states that the 300 talents were sent to the Athenian people, and refused by them.

Three years later, after the battle of Issus, Alexander in his letter to Darius accuses that prince of having sent both letters and money into Greece, for the purpose of exciting war against him. Alexander states that the Lacedæmonians accepted the money, but that all the other Grecian cities refused it (Arrian, ii. 14, 9). There is no reason to doubt these facts; but I find nothing identifying the precise point of time to which Alexander alludes.

of 335 B.C., and letters or emissaries to excite hostilities against Alexander.

Correspondence of Demosthenes with Persia—justifiable and politic.

That Demosthenes, and probably other leading orators, received such remittances from Persia, is no evidence of that personal corruption which is imputed to them by their enemies. It is noway proved that Demosthenes applied the money to his own private purposes. To receive and expend it in trying to organize combinations for the enfranchisement of Greece, was a proceeding which he would avow as not only legitimate but patriotic. It was aid obtained from one foreign prince to enable Hellas to throw off the worse dominion of another. At this moment, the political interests of Persia coincided with that of all Greeks who aspired to freedom. Darius had no chance of becoming master of Greece; but his own security prescribed to him to protect her from being made an appendage of the Macedonian kingdom, and his means of doing so were at this moment ample, had they been efficaciously put forth. Now the purpose of a Greek patriot would be to preserve the integrity and autonomy of the Hellenic world against all foreign interference. To invoke the aid of Persia against Hellenic enemies,—as Sparta had done both in the Peloponnesian war and at the peace of Antalkidas, and as Thebes and Athens had followed her example in doing afterwards—was an unwarrantable proceeding: but to invoke the same aid against the dominion of another foreigner, at once nearer and more formidable, was open to no blame on the score either of patriotism or policy. Demosthenes had vainly urged his countrymen to act with energy

against Philip, at a time when they might by their own efforts have upheld the existing autonomy both for Athens and for Greece generally. He now seconded or invited Darius, at a time when Greece single-handed had become incompetent to the struggle against Alexander, the common enemy both of Grecian liberty and of the Persian empire. Unfortunately for Athens as well as for himself, Darius, with full means of resistance in his hands, played his game against Alexander even with more stupidity and improvidence than Athens had played hers against Philip.

B.C. 335, spring. March of Alexander into Thrace. He forces his way over Mount Hæmus.

While such were the aggressions of Macedonian officers in the exercise of their new imperial authority, throughout Greece and the islands—and such the growing manifestations of repugnance to it at Athens—Alexander had returned home to push the preparations for his Persian campaign. He did not however think it prudent to transport his main force into Asia, until he had made his power and personal ascendency felt by the Macedonian dependencies, westward, northward, and north-eastward of Pella—Illyrians, Pæonians, and Thracians. Under these general names were comprised a number[1] of distinct tribes, or nations, warlike and for the most part predatory. Having remained unconquered until the victories of Philip, they were not kept in subjection even by him without difficulty: nor were they at all likely to obey his youthful suc-

[1] Strabo speaks of the Thracian ἔθνη as twenty-two in number, capable of sending out 200,000 foot, and 15,000 horses (Strabo, vii. Fragm. Vatic. 48).

cessor, until they had seen some sensible evidence of his personal energy.

Accordingly, in the spring, Alexander put himself at the head of a large force, and marched in an easterly direction from Amphipolis, through the narrow Sapæan pass between Philippi and the sea[1]. In ten days' march he reached the difficult mountain path over which alone he could cross Mount Hæmus (Balkan). Here he found a body of the free Thracians and of armed merchants of the country, assembled to oppose his progress; posted on the high ground with waggons in their front, which it was their purpose to roll down the steep declivity against the advancing ranks of the Macedonians. Alexander eluded this danger by ordering his soldiers either to open their ranks, so as to let the waggons go through freely—or where there was no room for such loose array, to throw themselves on the ground with their shields closely packed together and slanting over their bodies; so that the waggons, dashing down the steep and coming against the shields, were carried off the ground, and made to bound over the bodies of the men to the space below. All the waggons rolled down without killing a single man. The Thracians, badly armed, were then easily dispersed by the Macedonian attack, with the loss of 1500 men killed, and all their women and children

[1] Strabo, vii. p. 331 (Fragm.); Arrian, i. 1, 6; Appian, Bell. Civil. iv. 87, 105, 106. Appian gives (iv. 103) a good general description of the almost impassable and trackless country to the north and north-east of Philippi.

made prisoners[1]. The captives and plunder were sent back under an escort to be sold at the sea-ports.

His victory over the Triballi.

Having thus forced the mountain road, Alexander led his army over the chain of Mount Hæmus, and marched against the Triballi: a powerful Thracian tribe,—extending (as far as can be determined) from the plain of Kossovo in modern Servia northward towards the Danube,—whom Philip had conquered, yet not without considerable resistance and even occasional defeat. Their prince Syrmus had already retired with the women and children of the tribe into an island of the Danube called Peukê, where many other Thracians had also sought shelter. The main force of the Triballi took post in woody ground on the banks of the river Zyginus, about three days' march from the Danube. Being tempted however, by an annoyance from the Macedonian light-armed, to emerge from their covered position into the open plain, they were here attacked by Alexander with his cavalry and infantry, in close combat, and completely defeated. Three thousand of them were slain, but the rest mostly eluded pursuit by means of the wood, so that they lost few prisoners. The loss of the Macedonians was only eleven horsemen and forty foot slain; according to the statement of Ptolemy, son of Lagus, then one of Alexander's

[1] Arrian, i. 1, 12, 17. The precise locality of that steep road whereby Alexander crossed the Balkan, cannot be determined. Baron von Moltke, in his account of the Russian campaign in Bulgaria (1828–1829), gives an enumeration of four roads, passable by an army, crossing this chain from north to south (see chap. i. of that work). But whether Alexander passed by any one of these four, or by some other road still more to the west, we cannot tell.

confidential officers, and afterwards founder of the dynasty of Greco-Egyptian kings[1].

He crosses the Danube, defeats the Getæ, and returns back.

Three days' march, from the scene of action, brought Alexander to the Danube, where he found some armed ships which had been previously ordered to sail (probably with stores of provision) from Byzantium round by the Euxine and up the river. He first employed these ships in trying to land a body of troops on the island of Peukê; but his attempt was frustrated by the steep banks, the rapid stream, and the resolute front of the defenders on shore. To compensate for this disappointment, Alexander resolved to make a display of his strength by crossing the Danube and attacking the Getæ; tribes, chiefly horsemen armed with bows[2], analogous to the Thracians in habits and language. They occupied the left bank of the river, from which their town was about four miles distant. The terror of the Macedonian successes had brought together a body of 4000 Getæ, visible from the opposite shore, to resist any crossing. Accordingly Alexander got together a quantity of the rude boats (hollowed out of a single trunk) employed for transport on the river, and caused the tent-skins of the army to be stuffed with hay in order to support rafts. He then put himself on shipboard during the night, and contrived to carry across the river a body of 4000 infantry, and 1500 cavalry; landing on a part of the bank where there was high standing wheat and no enemy's post. The Getæ, intimidated not less by this successful passage than by the excellent array of Alexander's army, hardly

[1] Arrian, i. 2.

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 303.

stayed to sustain a charge of cavalry, but hastened to abandon their poorly fortified town and retire farther away from the river. Entering the town without resistance, he destroyed it, carried away such moveables as he found, and then returned to the river without delay. Before he quitted the northern bank, he offered sacrifice to Zeus the Preserver—to Hêraklês—and to the God Ister (Danube) himself, whom he thanked for having shown himself not impassable[1]. On the very same day, he recrossed the river to his camp; after an empty demonstration of force, intended to prove that he could do what neither his father nor any Grecian army had ever yet done, and what every one deemed impossible—crossing the greatest of all known rivers without a bridge and in the face of an enemy[2].

[1] Arrian, i. 4, 2–7.

[2] Neither the point where Alexander crossed the Danube,—nor the situation of the island called Peukê,—nor the identity of the river Lyginus,—nor the part of Mount Hæmus which Alexander forced his way over—can be determined. The data given by Arrian are too brief and too meagre, to make out with assurance any part of his march after he crossed the Nestus. The facts reported by the historian represent only a small portion of what Alexander really did in this expedition.

It seems clear however that the main purpose of Alexander was to attack and humble the Triballi. Their locality is known generally as the region where the modern Servia joins Bulgaria. They reached eastward (in the times of Thucydides, ii. 96) as far as the river Oskius or Isker, which crosses the chain of Hæmus from south to north, passes by the modern city of Sophia, and falls into the Danube. Now Alexander, in order to conduct his army from the eastern bank of the river Nestus, near its mouth, to the country of the Triballi, would naturally pass through Philippópolis, which city appears to have been founded by his father Philip, and therefore probably had a regular road of communication to the maritime regions. (See Stephanus Byz. v. Φιλιππόπολις.) Alexander would cross Mount Hæmus, then, somewhere north-west of Philippopolis. We read in the year 376 B.C. (Diodor. xv. 36) of an invasion of Abdêra

The terror spread by Alexander's military operations was so great, that not only the Triballi, but the other autonomous Thracians around, sent envoys tendering presents or tribute, and soliciting peace. Alexander granted their request. His mind being bent upon war with Asia, he was satisfied with having intimidated these tribes so as to deter them from rising during his absence. What con-

by the Triballi; which shows that there was a road, not unfit for an army, from their territory to the eastern side of the mouth of the river Nestus, where Abdêra was situated. This was the road which Alexander is likely to have followed. But he must probably have made a considerable circuit to the eastward; for the route which Paul Lucas describes himself as having taken direct from Philippopolis to Drama, can hardly have been fit for an army.

The river Lyginus may perhaps be the modern Isker, but this is not certain. The island called Peukê is still more perplexing. Strabo speaks of it as if it were near the mouth of the Danube (vii. p. 301–305). But it seems impossible that either the range of the Triballi, or the march of Alexander, can have extended so far eastward. Since Strabo (as well as Arrian) copied Alexander's march from Ptolemy, whose authority is very good, we are compelled to suppose that there was a second island called Peukê higher up the river.

The geography of Thrace is so little known, that we cannot wonder at our inability to identify these places. We are acquainted, and that but imperfectly, with the two high roads, both starting from Byzantium or Constantinople. 1. The one (called the King's Road, from having been in part the march of Xerxes in his invasion of Greece, Livy, xxxix. 27; Herodot. vii. 115) crossing the Hebrus and the Nestus, touching the northern coast of the Ægean Sea at Neapolis, a little south of Philippi, then crossing the Strymon at Amphipolis, and stretching through Pella across Inner Macedonia and Illyria to Dyrrachium (the Via Egnatia). 2. The other, taking a more northerly course, passing along the upper valley of the Hebrus from Adrianople to Philippopolis, then through Sardica (Sophia) and Naissus (Nisch), to the Danube near Belgrade; being the high road now followed from Constantinople to Belgrade.

But apart from these two roads, scarcely anything whatever is known of the country. Especially the mountainous region of Rhodopê, bounded on the west by the Strymon, on the north and east by the Hebrus, and on the south by the Ægean, is a Terra Incognita, except the few Grecian colonies on the coast. Very few travellers have passed

ditions he imposed, we do not know, but he accepted the presents[1].

Embassy of Gauls to Alexander. His self-conceit.

While these applications from the Thracians were under debate, envoys arrived from a tribe of Gauls occupying a distant mountainous region westward towards the Ionic Gulf. Though strangers to Alexander, they had heard so much of the recent exploits, that they came with demands to be admitted to his friendship. They were distinguished both for tall stature and for boastful language. Alexander readily exchanged with them assurances of alliance. Entertaining them at a feast, he asked, in the course of conversation, what it was that they were most afraid of, among human contingences? They replied, that they feared no man, nor any danger, except only, lest the heaven should fall upon them. Their answer disappointed Alexander, who had expected that they would name him, as the person of whom they were most afraid; so prodigious was his conceit of his own exploits. He observed to his friends that these Gauls were swag-

along or described the southern or King's Road, while the region in the interior, apart from the high road, was absolutely unexplored until the visit of M. Viquesnel in 1847, under scientific mission from the French government. The brief, but interesting account, composed by M. Viquesnel, of this rugged and impracticable district, is contained in the "Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Litteraires" for 1850, published at Paris. Unfortunately, the map intended to accompany that account has not yet been prepared; but the published data, as far as they go, have been employed by Kiepert in constructing his recent map of Turkey in Europe; the best map of these regions now existing, though still very imperfect. The Illustrations (Erläuterungen) annexed by Kiepert to his map of Turkey, show the defective data on which the chartography of this country is founded. Until the survey of M. Viquesnel, the higher part of the course of the Strymon, and nearly all the course of the Nestus, may be said to have been wholly unknown.

[1] Arrian, i. 4, 5; Strabo, vii. p. 301.

gerers. Yet if we attend to the sentiment rather than the language, we shall see that such an epithet applies with equal or greater propriety to Alexander himself. The anecdote is chiefly interesting as it proves at how early an age the exorbitant self-esteem, which we shall hereafter find him manifesting, began. That after the battle of Issus he should fancy himself superhuman, we can hardly be astonished; but he was as yet only in the first year of his reign, and had accomplished nothing beyond his march into Thrace and his victory over the Triballi.

Victories of Alexander over Kleitus and the Illyrians.

After arranging these matters, he marched in a south-westerly direction into the territory of the Agriânes and the other Pæonians, between the rivers Strymon and Axius in the highest portion of their course. Here he was met by a body of Agrianes under their prince Langarus, who had already contracted a personal friendship for him at Pella before Philip's death. News came that the Illyrian Kleitus, son of Bardylis, who had been subdued by Philip, had revolted at Pelion (a strong post south of lake Lychnidus, on the west side of the chain of Skardus and Pindus, near the place where that chain is broken by the cleft called the Klissura of Tzangon or Devol[1])—and that the western Illyrians, called Taulantii, under their prince Glaukias, were on the march to assist him. Accordingly Alexander proceeded thither forthwith, leaving Langarus to deal with the Illyrian tribe

[1] For the situation of Pelion, compare Livy, xxxi. 33, 34, and the remarks of Colonel Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, vol. iii. ch. 28. p. 310-324.

Autariatæ, who had threatened to oppose his progress. He marched along the bank and up the course of the Erigon, from a point near where it joins the Axius[1]. On approaching Pelion, he found the Illyrians posted in front of the town and on the heights around, awaiting the arrival of Glaukias their promised ally. While Alexander was making his dispositions for attack, they offered their sacrifices to the gods: the victims being three boys, three girls, and three black rams. At first they stepped boldly forward to meet him, but before coming to close quarters, they turned and fled into the town with such haste that the slain victims were left lying on the spot[2]. Having thus driven in the defenders, Alexander was preparing to draw a wall of circumvallation round the Pelion, when he was interrupted by the arrival of Glaukias with so large a force as to compel him to abandon the project. A body of cavalry, sent out from the Macedonian camp under Philotas to forage, were

[1] Assuming Alexander to have been in the territory of the Triballi, the modern Servia, he would in this march follow mainly the road which is now frequented between Belgrade and Bitolia; through the plain of Kossovo, Pristina, Katschanik (rounding on the north-eastern side the Ljubatrin, the north-eastern promontory terminating the chain of Skardus), Uschkub, Kuprili, along the higher course of the Axius or Vardar until the point where the Erigon or Tscherna joins that river below Kuprili. Here he would be among the Pæonians and Agrianes, on the east—and the Dardani and Autariatæ, seemingly on the north and west. If he then followed the course of the Erigon, he would pass through the portions of Macedonia then called Deuriopia and Pelagonia: he would go between the ridges of mountains, through which the Erigon breaks, called Nidje on the south, and Babuna on the north. He would pass afterwards to Florina, and not to Bitolia.

See Kiepert's map of these regions—a portion of his recent map of Turkey in Europe—and Grisebach's description of the general track.

[2] Arrian, i. 5, 12.

in danger of being cut off by Glaukias, and were only rescued by the arrival of Alexander himself with a reinforcement. In the face of this superior force, it was necessary to bring off the Macedonian army, through a narrow line of road along the river Eordaikus, where in some places there was only room for four abreast, with hill or marsh everywhere around. By a series of bold and skilful manœuvres, and by effective employment of his battering-train or projectile machines to protect the rear-guard, Alexander completely baffled the enemy, and brought off his army without loss[1]. Moreover these Illyrians, who had not known how to make use of such advantages of position, abandoned themselves to disorder as soon as their enemy had retreated, neglecting all precautions for the safety of their camp. Apprised of this carelessness, Alexander made a forced night-march back, at the head of his Agrianian division and light troops supported by the remaining army. He surprised the Illyrians in their camp before daylight. The success of this attack against a sleeping and unguarded army was so complete, that the Illyrians fled at once without resistance. Many were slain or taken prisoners; the rest, throwing away their arms, hurried away homeward, pursued by Alexander for a considerable distance. The Illyrian prince Kleitus was forced to evacuate Pelion, which place he burned, and then retired into the territory of Glaukias[2].

B.C. 335, August. Just as Alexander had completed this victory over Kleitus and the Taulantian auxiliaries, and before he had returned home, news reached him of

[1] Arrian, i. 6, 3–18. [2] Arrian, i. 6, 19–22.

a menacing character. The Thebans had declared themselves independent of him, and were besieging his garrison in the Kadmeia.

The Thebans declare their independence against Macedonia.

Of this event, alike important and disastrous to those who stood forward, the immediate antecedents are very imperfectly known to us. It has already been remarked that the vote of submission on the part of the Greeks to Alexander as Imperator, during the preceding autumn, had been passed only under the intimidation of a present Macedonian force. Though the Spartans alone had courage to proclaim their dissent, the Athenians, Arcadians, Ætolians, and others, were well known even to Alexander himself, as ready to do the like on any serious reverse to the Macedonian arms[1]. Moreover the energy and ability displayed by Alexander had taught the Persian king that all danger to himself was not removed by the death of Philip, and induced him either to send, or to promise, pecuniary aid to the anti-Macedonian Greeks. We have already noticed the manifestation of anti-Macedonian sentiment at Athens—proclaimed by several of the most eminent orators—Demosthenes, Lykurgus, Hyperides, and others; as well as by active military men like Charidemus and Ephialtes[2], who probably spoke out more boldly when Alexander was absent on the Danube. In other cities, the same sentiment doubtless found advocates, though less distinguished; but at Thebes, where it could not be openly proclaimed, it prevailed with the greatest force[3]. The Thebans suffered an oppression from

[1] Arrian, i. 7, 5.

[2] Ælian, V. H. xii. 57.

[3] Demades, ὑπὲρ τῆς δωδεκαετίας, s. 14. Θηβαῖοι δὲ μέγιστον εἶχον

which most of the other cities were free—the presence of a Macedonian garrison in their citadel; just as they had endured, fifty years before, the curb of a Spartan garrison after the fraud of Phœbidas and Leontiades. In this case, as in the former, the effect was to arm the macedonising leaders with absolute power over their fellow-citizens, and to inflict upon the latter not merely the public mischief of extinguishing all free speech, but also multiplied individual insults and injuries, prompted by the lust and rapacity of rulers, foreign as well as domestic[1]. A number of Theban citizens, among them the freest and boldest spirits, were in exile at Athens, receiving from the public indeed nothing beyond a safe home, but secretly encouraged to hope for better things by Demosthenes and the other anti-Macedonian leaders[2]. In like manner, fifty years before, it was at Athens, and from private Athenian citizens, that the Thebans Pelopidas and Mellon had found that sympathy which enabled them to organise their daring conspiracy for rescuing Thebes from the Spartans. That enterprise, admired

δεσμὸν τὴν τῶν Μακεδόνων φρουρὰν, ὑφ' ἧς οὐ μόνον τὰς χεῖρας συνεδέθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν παῤῥησίαν ἀφῄρηντο.....

[1] The Thebans, in setting forth their complaints to the Arcadians, stated—*ὅτι οὐ τὴν πρὸν τοὺς Ἕλληνας φιλίαν Θηβαῖοι διαλῦσαι βουλόμενοι, τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπανέστησαν, οὐδ' ἐνάντιον τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐδὲν πράξοντες, ἀλλὰ τὰ παῤ αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐν τῇ πόλει γινόμενα φέρειν οὐκέτι δυνάμενοι, οὐδὲ τὴν δούλειαν ὑπομένειν, οὐδὲ τὰς ὕβρεις ὁρᾷν τὰς εἰς τὰ ἐλεύθερα σώματα γινομένας.*

See Demades *περὶ τῆς δωδεκαετίας*, s. 13, the speech of Cleadas, Justin, xi. 4; and (Deinarchus cont. Demosth. s. 20) compare Livy, xxxix. 27—about the working of the Macedonian garrison at Maroneia, in the time of Philip son of Demetrius.

[2] Demades *περὶ τῆς δωδεκαετίας*, Fragm. ad fin.

throughout Greece as alike adventurous, skilful, and heroic, was the model present to the imagination of the Theban exiles, to be copied if any tolerable opportunity occurred.

B.C. 335. They are encouraged by Alexander's long absence in Thrace, and by reports of his death.

Such was the feeling in Greece, during the long absence of Alexander on his march into Thrace and Illyria; a period of four or five months, ending at August 335 B.C. Not only was Alexander thus long absent, but he sent home no reports of his proceedings. Couriers were likely enough to be intercepted among the mountains and robbers of Thrace; and even if they reached Pella, their despatches were not publicly read, as such communications would have been read to the Athenian assembly. Accordingly we are not surprised to hear that rumours arose of his having been defeated and slain. Among these reports, both multiplied and confident, one was even certified by a liar who pretended to have just arrived from Thrace, to have been an eye-witness of the fact, and to have been himself wounded in the action against the Triballi, where Alexander had perished[1]. This welcome news, not fabricated, but too hastily credited, by Demosthenes and Lykurgus[2], was announced to

[1] Arrian, i. 7, 3. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ πολὺς ὁ λόγος (of the death of Alexander) καὶ παρὰ πολλῶν ἐφοίτα, ὅτι τε χρόνον ἀπῆν οὐκ ὀλίγον καὶ ὅτι οὐδεμία ἀγγελία παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀφίκτο, &c.

[2] Demades περὶ τῆς δωδεκαετίας, ad fin. ἡνίκα Δημοσθένης καὶ Λυκοῦργος τῷ μὲν λόγῳ παρατεττόμενοι τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἐνίκων ἐν Τριβάλλοις, μόνον δ' οὐχ ὁρατὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος νεκρὸν τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον προέθηκαν.....ἐμὲ δὲ στυγνὸν καὶ περίλυπον ἔφασκον εἶναι μὴ συνευδοκοῦντα, &c.

Justin, xi. 2. "Demosthenem oratorem, qui Macedonum deletas omnes cum rege copias à Triballis affirmaverit, producto in concionem

the Athenian assembly. In spite of doubts expressed by Demades and Phokion, it was believed not only by the Athenians and the Theban exiles there present, but also by the Arcadians, Eleians, Ætolians and other Greeks. For a considerable time, through the absence of Alexander, it remained uncontradicted, which increased the confidence in its truth.

The Theban exiles from Athens get possession of Thebes.

It was upon the full belief in this rumour, of Alexander's defeat and death, that the Grecian cities proceeded. The event severed by itself their connexion with Macedonia. There was neither son nor adult brother to succeed to the throne: so that not merely the foreign ascendency, but even the intestine unity, of Macedonia, was likely to be broken up. In regard to Athens, Arcadia, Elis, Ætolia, &c., the anti-Macedonian sentiment was doubtless vehemently manifested, but no special action was called for. It was otherwise in regard to Thebes. Phœnix, Prochytes, and other Theban exiles at Athens, immediately laid their plan for liberating their city and expelling the Macedonian garrison from the Kadmeia. Assisted with arms and money by Demosthenes and other Athenian

auctore, qui in eo prælio, in quo rex ceciderit, se quoque vulneratum diceret."

Compare Tacitus, Histor. i. 34. "Vix dum egresso Pisone, occisum in castris Othonem, vagus primum et incertus rumor, mox, ut *in magnis mendaciis, interfuisse se quidam, et vidisse affirmabant*, credulâ famâ inter gaudentes et incuriosos..... Obvius in palatio Julius Atticus, speculator, cruentum gladium ostentans, occisum *à se* Othonem exclamavit."

It is stated that Alexander was really wounded in the head by a stone, in the action with the Illyrians (Plutarch, Fortun. Alex. p. 327).

citizens, and invited by their partizans at Thebes, they suddenly entered that city in arms. Though unable to carry the Kadmeia by surprise, they seized in the city, and put to death, Amyntas, a principal Macedonian officer, with Timolaus, one of the leading macedonizing Thebans[1]. They then immediately convoked a general assembly of the Thebans, to whom they earnestly appealed for a vigorous effort to expel the Macedonians, and reconquer the ancient freedom of the city. Expatiating upon the misdeeds of the garrison and upon the oppressions of those Thebans who governed by means of the garrison, they proclaimed that the happy moment of liberation had now arrived, through the recent death of Alexander. They doubtless recalled the memory of Pelopidas, and the glorious enterprise, cherished by all Theban patriots, whereby he had rescued the city from Spartan occupation, forty-six years before. To this appeal the Thebans cordially responded. The assembly passed a vote, declaring severance from Macedonia, and autonomy of Thebes—and naming as Bœotarchs some of the returned exiles, with others of the same party, for the purpose of energetic measures against the garrison in the Kadmeia[2].

Unfortunately for Thebes, none of these new Bœotarchs were men of the stamp of Epaminondas, probably not even of Pelopidas. Yet their scheme, though from its melancholy result it is generally

[1] Arrian, i. 7, 1: compare Deinarchus cont. Demosthenes, s. 75. p. 53.

[2] Arrian, i. 7, 3–17.

They besiege the Macedonians in the Kadmeia, and entreat aid from other Greeks. Favourable sympathies shown towards them, but no positive aid.

denounced as insane, really promised better at first than that of the anti-Spartan conspirators in 380 B.C. The Kadmeia was instantly summoned; hopes being perhaps indulged, that the Macedonian commander would surrender it with as little resistance as the Spartan harmost had done. But such hopes were not realized. Philip had probably caused the citadel to be both strengthened and provisioned. The garrison defied the Theban leaders, who did not feel themselves strong enough to give orders for an assault, as Pelopidas in his time was prepared to do, if surrender had been denied[1]. They contented themselves with drawing and guarding a double line of circumvallation round the Kadmeia, so as to prevent both sallies from within and supplies from without[2]. They then sent envoys in the melancholy equipment of suppliants, to the Arcadians and others, representing that their recent movement was directed, not against Hellenic union, but against Macedonian oppression and outrage, which pressed upon them with intolerable bitterness. As Greeks and freemen, they entreated aid to rescue them from such a calamity. They obtained much favourable sympathy, with some promise and even half-performance. Many of the leading orators at Athens—Demosthenes, Lykurgus, Hyperides, and others—together with the military men Charidemus and Ephialtes—strongly urged their countrymen to declare in favour of Thebes and send aid against the Kadmeia. But the citizens generally, follow-

[1] Xenoph. Hellen. v. 4, 11. See Volume X. Ch. lxxvii. p. 122 of this History.

[2] Arrian, i. 7, 14.

ing Demades and Phokion, waited to be better assured both of Alexander's death and of its consequences, before they would incur the hazard of open hostility against Macedonia, though they seem to have declared sympathy with the Theban revolution[1]. Demosthenes farther went as envoy into Peloponnesus, while the Macedonian Antipater also sent round urgent applications to the Peloponnesian cities, requiring their contingents, as members of the confederacy under Alexander, to act against Thebes. The eloquence of Demosthenes, backed by his money, or by Persian money administered through him, prevailed on the Peloponnesians to refuse compliance with Antipater and to send no contingents against Thebes[2]. The Eleians and Ætolians held out general assurances favourable to the revolution at Thebes, while the Arcadians even went so far as to send out some troops to second it, though they did not advance beyond the isthmus[3].

Chances of Thebes and liberation, not unfavourable.

Here was a crisis in Grecian affairs, opening new possibilities for the recovery of freedom. Had the Arcadians and other Greeks lent decisive aid to Thebes—had Athens acted even with as much

[1] Diodor. xvii. 8.

[2] Deinarchus cont. Demosth. p. 14. s. 19: καὶ Ἀρκάδων ἡκόντων εἰς ἰσθμὸν, καὶ τὴν μὲν παρὰ Ἀντιπάτρου πρεσβείαν ἄπρακτον ἀποστειλάντων, &c.

In the vote passed by the people of Athens some years afterwards, awarding a statue and other honours to Demosthenes, these proceedings in Peloponnesus are enumerated among his titles to public gratitude —καὶ ὡς ἐκώλυσε Πελοποννησίους ἐπὶ Θήβας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ βοηθῆσαι, χρήματα δοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς πρεσβεύσας, &c. (Plutarch, Vit. X. Orator. p. 850).

[3] Arrian, i. 10, 2; Æschines adv. Ktesiphont. p. 634.

energy as she did twelve years afterwards during the Lamian war, occupying Thermopylæ with an army and a fleet—the gates of Greece might well have been barred against a new Macedonian force, even with Alexander alive and at its head. That the struggle of Thebes was not regarded at the time, even by macedonising Greeks, as hopeless, is shown by the subsequent observations both of Æschines and Deinarchus at Athens. Æschines (delivering five years afterwards his oration against Ktesiphon) accuses Demosthenes of having by his perverse backwardness brought about the ruin of Thebes. The foreign mercenaries forming part of the garrison of the Kadmeia were ready (Æschines affirms) to deliver up that fortress, on receiving five talents: the Arcadian generals would have brought up their troops to the aid of Thebes, if nine or ten talents had been paid to them—having repudiated the solicitations of Antipater. Demosthenes (say these two orators) having in his possession 300 talents from the Persian king, to instigate anti-Macedonian movements in Greece, was supplicated by the Theban envoys to furnish money for these purposes, but refused the request, kept the money for himself, and thus prevented both the surrender of the Kadmeia and the onward march of the Arcadians[1]. The charge here advanced against Demosthenes appears utterly incredible. To suppose that anti-Macedonian movements counted for so little in his eyes, is an hypothesis belied by his whole history. But the fact that such allega-

[1] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 634; Deinarch. adv. Demosth. p. 15, 16. s. 19–22.

tions were made by Æschines only five years afterwards, proves the reports and the feelings of the time—that the chances of successful resistance to Macedonia on the part of the Thebans were not deemed unfavourable. And when the Athenians, following the counsels of Demades and Phokion, refused to aid Thebes or occupy Thermopylæ—they perhaps consulted the safety of Athens separately, but they receded from the generous and Pan-hellenic patriotism which had animated their ancestors against Xerxes and Mardonius[1].

The Thebans, though left in this ungenerous isolation, pressed the blockade of the Kadmeia, and would presently have reduced the Macedonian garrison, had they not been surprised by the awe-striking event—Alexander arriving in person at Onchêstus in Bœotia, at the head of his victorious army. The first news of his being alive was fur-

[1] See Herod. viii. 143. Demosthenes in his orations frequently insists on the different rank and position of Athens, as compared with those of the smaller Grecian states—and of the higher and more arduous obligations consequent thereupon. This is one grand point of distinction between his policy and that of Phokion. See a striking passage in the speech De Coronâ, p. 245. s. 77; and Orat. De Republ. Ordinand. p. 176. s. 37.

Isokrates holds the same language touching the obligations of Sparta, —in the speech which he puts into the mouth of Archidamus. "No one will quarrel with Epidaurians and Phlasians, for looking only how they can get through and keep themselves in being. But for Lacedæmonians, it is impossible to aim simply at preservation and nothing beyond—by any means, whatever they may be. If we cannot preserve ourselves with honour, we ought to prefer a glorious death." (Isokrates, Orat. vi. Archid. s. 106.)

The backward and narrow policy, which Isokrates here proclaims as fit for Epidaurus and Phlius, but not for Sparta—is precisely what Phokion always recommended for Athens, even while Philip's power was yet nascent and unsettled.

nished by his arrival at Onchêstus. No one could at first believe the fact. The Theban leaders contended that it was another Alexander, the son of Aëropus, at the head of a Macedonian army of relief[1].

Rapid march and unexpected arrival of Alexander with his army before Thebes. His good fortune as to the time of hearing the news.

In this incident we may note two features, which characterized Alexander to the end of his life; matchless celerity of movement, and no less remarkable favour of fortune. Had news of the Theban rising first reached him while on the Danube or among the distant Triballi,—or even when embarrassed in the difficult region round Pelion,—he could hardly by any effort have arrived in time to save the Kadmeia. But he learnt it just when he had vanquished Kleitus and Glaukias, so that his hands were perfectly free—and also when he was in a position peculiarly near and convenient for a straight march into Greece without going back to Pella. From the pass of Tschangon (or of the river Devol), near which Alexander's last victories were gained, his road lay southward, following downwards in part the higher course of the river Haliakmon, through Upper Macedonia or the regions called Eordæa and Elymeia which lay on his left, while the heights of Pindus and the upper course of the river Aous, occupied by the Epirots called Tymphæi and Parauæi, were on the right. On the seventh day of march, crossing the lower ridges of the Cambunian mountains (which separate Olympus from Pindus and Upper Macedonia from Thessaly), Alexander reached the Thessalian town of Pelinna. Six days more brought him to the

[1] Arrian, i. 7, 9.

Bœotian Onchestus[1]. He was already within Thermopylæ, before any Greeks were aware that he was in march, or even that he was alive. The question about occupying Thermopylæ by a Grecian force was thus set aside. The difficulty of forcing that pass, and the necessity of forestalling Athens in it by stratagem or celerity, was present to the mind of Alexander, as it had been to that of Philip in his expedition of 346 B.C. against the Phokians.

His arrival, in itself a most formidable event, told with double force on the Greeks from its extreme suddenness. We can hardly doubt that both Athenians and Thebans had communications at Pella—that they looked upon any Macedonian invasion as likely to come from thence—and that they expected Alexander himself (assuming him to be still living, contrary to their belief) back in his capital before he began any new enterprise. Upon this hypothesis—in itself probable, and such as would have been realised if Alexander had not already advanced so far southward at the moment when he received the news[2]—they would at least have known beforehand of his approach, and would have had the option of a defensive combination open. As it happened, his unexpected appearance in the heart of Greece precluded all combinations, and checked all idea of resistance.

Two days after his arrival in Bœotia, he marched

[1] Arrian, i. 7, 6. See, respecting this region, Colonel Leake's Travels in Northern Greece, ch. vi. p. 300-304; ch. xxviii. p. 303-305, &c.; and for Alexander's line of march, the Map at the end of the volume.

[2] Diodorus (xvii. 9) incorrectly says that Alexander came back unexpectedly from *Thrace*. Had this been the fact, he would have come by Pella.

Siege of Thebes. Proclamation of Alexander. Determination of the Thebans to resist.

his army round Thebes, so as to encamp on the south side of the city; whereby he both intercepted the communication of the Thebans with Athens, and exhibited his force more visibly to the garrison in the Kadmeia. The Thebans, though alone and without hope of succour, maintained their courage unshaken. Alexander deferred the attack for a day or two, in hopes that they would submit; he wished to avoid an assault which might cost the lives of many of his soldiers, whom he required for his Asiatic schemes. He even made public proclamation[1], demanding the surrender of the anti-Macedonian leaders Phœnix and Prochytes, but offering to any other Theban who chose to quit the city, permission to come and join him on the terms of the convention sworn in the preceding autumn. A general assembly being convened, the macedonising Thebans enforced the prudence of submission to an irresistible force. But the leaders recently returned from exile, who had headed the rising, warmly opposed this proposition, contending for resistance to the death. In them, such resolution may not be wonderful, since (as Arrian[2] remarks) they had gone too far to hope for lenity. As it appears however that the mass of citizens deliberately adopted the same resolution, in spite of strong persuasion to the contrary[3], we see plainly that they had already felt the bitterness of Macedonian dominion, and that sooner than endure a renewal of it, sure to be yet worse, coupled with the dishonour of surrendering their leaders—they had made up their

[1] Diodor. xvii. 9; Plutarch, Alexand. 11.

[2] Arrian, i. 7, 16.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 9.

minds to perish with the freedom of their city. At a time when the sentiment of Hellas as an autonomous system was passing away, and when Grecian courage was degenerating into a mere instrument for the aggrandisement of Macedonian chiefs, these countrymen of Epaminondas and Pelopidas set an example of devoted self-sacrifice in the cause of Grecian liberty, not less honourable than that of Leonidas at Thermopylæ, and only less esteemed because it proved infructuous.

Capture of Thebes by assault. Massacre of the population.

In reply to the proclamation of Alexander, the Thebans made from their walls a counter-proclamation, demanding the surrender of his officers Antipater and Philotas, and inviting every one to join them, who desired, in concert with the Persian king and the Thebans, to liberate the Greeks, and put down the despot of Hellas[1]. Such a haughty defiance and retort incensed Alexander to the quick. He brought up his battering engines, and prepared everything for storming the town. Of the murderous assault which followed, we find different accounts, not agreeing with each other, yet not wholly irreconcileable. It appears that the Thebans had erected, probably in connexion with their operations against the Kadmeia, an outwork defended by a double palisade. Their walls were guarded by the least effective soldiers, metics and liberated slaves; while their best troops were bold enough to go forth in front of the gates and give battle. Alexander divided his army into three divisions; one under Perdikkas and Amyntas, against the outwork—a second, destined to combat the Thebans who sallied

[1] Diodor. xvii. 9.

out—and a third, held in reserve. Between the second of these three divisions, and the Thebans in front of the gates, the battle was so obstinately contested, that success at one time seemed doubtful, and Alexander was forced to order up his reserve. The first Macedonian success was gained by Perdikkas[1], who, aided by the division of Amyntas and

[1] The attack of Perdikkas was represented by Ptolemy, from whom Arrian copies (i. 8, 1), not only as being the first and only attack made by the Macedonian army on Thebes, but also as made by Perdikkas *without orders from Alexander*, who was forced to support it in order to preserve Perdikkas from being overwhelmed by the Thebans. According to Ptolemy and Arrian, therefore, the storming of Thebes took place both without the orders, and against the wishes, of Alexander; the capture moreover was effected rapidly with little trouble to the besieging army (ἡ ἅλωσις δι' ὀλίγου τε καὶ οὐ ξὺν πόνῳ τῶν ἑλόντων ξυνενεχθεῖσα, Arr. i. 9, 9): the bloodshed and pillage was committed by the vindictive sentiment of the Bœotian allies.

Diodorus had before him a very different account. He affirms that Alexander both combined and ordered the assault—that the Thebans behaved like bold and desperate men, resisting obstinately and for a long time—that the slaughter afterwards was committed by the general body of the assailants; the Bœotian allies being doubtless conspicuous among them. Diodorus gives this account at some length, and with his customary rhetorical amplifications. Plutarch and Justin are more brief; but coincide in the same general view, and not in that of Arrian. Polyænus again (iv. 3, 12) gives something different from all.

To me it appears that the narrative of Diodorus is (in its basis, and striking off rhetorical amplifications) more credible than that of Arrian. Admitting the attack made by Perdikkas, I conceive it to have been a portion of the general plan of Alexander. I cannot think it probable that Perdikkas attacked without orders, or that Thebes was captured with little resistance. It was captured by *one* assault (Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 524), but by an assault well-combined and stoutly contested—not by one begun without preparation or order, and successful after hardly any resistance. Alexander, after having offered what he thought liberal terms, was not the man to shrink from carrying his point by force; nor would the Thebans have refused those terms, unless their minds had been made up for strenuous and desperate defence, without hope of ultimate success.

What authority Diodorus followed, we do not know. He may have followed Kleitarchus, a contemporary and an Æolian, who must have had good means of information respecting such an event as the capture

also by the Agrianian regiment and the bowmen, carried the first of the two outworks, as well as a postern gate which had been left unguarded. His troops also stormed the second outwork, though he himself was severely wounded and borne away to the camp. Here the Theban defenders fled back into the city, along the hollow way which led to the temple of Herakles, pursued by the light troops, in advance of the rest. Upon these men, however, the Thebans presently turned, repelling them with the loss of Eurybotas their commanding officer and seventy men slain. In pursuing these bowmen, the ranks of the Thebans became somewhat disordered, so that they were unable to resist the steady charge of the Macedonian guards and heavy infantry coming up in support. They were broken, and pushed back into the city; their rout being rendered still more complete by a sally of the

of Thebes (see Geier, Alexandri M, Historiarum Scriptores ætate suppares, Leips. 1844, p. 6-152; and Vossius, De Historicis Græcis, i. x. p. 90, ed. Westermann). I have due respect for the authority of Ptolemy, but I cannot go along with Geier and other critics who set aside all other witnesses, even contemporary, respecting Alexander, as worthy of little credit, unless where such witnesses are confirmed by Ptolemy or Aristobulus. We must remember that Ptolemy did not compose his book until after he became king of Egypt, in 306 B.C.; nor indeed until after the battle of Ipsus in 301, according to Geier (p. 1); at least twenty-nine years after the sack of Thebes. Moreover, Ptolemy was not ashamed of what Geier calls (p. 11) the "pious fraud" of announcing, that two speaking serpents conducted the army of Alexander to the holy precinct of Zeus Ammon (Arrian, iii. 3). Lastly, it will be found that the depositions which are found in other historians, but not in Ptolemy and Aristobulus, relate principally to matters discreditable to Alexander. That Ptolemy and Aristobulus *omitted*, is in my judgment far more probable, than that other historians *invented*. Admiring biographers would easily excuse themselves for refusing to proclaim to the world such acts as the massacre of the Branchidæ, or the dragging of the wounded Batis at Gaza.

Macedonian garrison out of the Kadmeia. The assailants being victorious on this side, the Thebans who were maintaining the combat without the gates were compelled to retreat, and the advancing Macedonians forced their way into the town along with them. Within the town, however, the fighting still continued; the Thebans resisting in organised bodies as long as they could; and when broken, still resisting even single-handed. None of the military population sued for mercy; most of them were slain in the streets; but a few cavalry and infantry cut their way out into the plain and escaped. The fight now degenerated into a carnage. The Macedonians with their Pæonian contingents were incensed with the obstinate resistance; while various Greeks serving as auxiliaries—Phokians, Orchomenians, Thespians, Platæans,—had to avenge ancient and grievous injuries endured from Thebes. Such furious feelings were satiated by an indiscriminate massacre of all who came in their way, without distinction of age or sex—old men, women, and children, in houses and even in temples. This wholesale slaughter was accompanied of course by all the plunder and manifold outrage with which victorious assailants usually reward themselves[1].

Thebes is razed; the Theban captives sold as slaves; the territory distributed among the neighbouring cities.

More than five hundred Macedonians are asserted to have been slain, and six thousand Thebans. Thirty thousand captives were collected[2]. The final destiny of these captives, and of Thebes itself, was submitted by Alexander to the Orchomenians,

[1] Arrian, i. 8; Diodor. xvii. 12, 13.

[2] Diodorus (xvii. 14) and Plutarch (Alexand. 11) agree in giving the totals of 6000 and 30,000.

Platæans, Phokians, and other Grecian auxiliaries in the assault. He must have known well beforehand what the sentence of such judges would be. They pronounced, that the city of Thebes should be razed to the ground: that the Kadmeia alone should be maintained, as a military post with Macedonian garrison: that the Theban territory should be distributed among the allies themselves: that Orchomenus and Platæa should be rebuilt and fortified: that all the captive Thebans, men, women, and children, should be sold as slaves—excepting only priests and priestesses, and such as were connected by recognised ties of hospitality with Philip or Alexander, or such as had been *proxeni* of the Macedonians: that the Thebans who had escaped should be proclaimed outlaws, liable to arrest and death, wherever they were found; and that every Grecian city should be interdicted from harbouring them[1].

The Kadmeia is occupied as a Macedonian military post. Retribution upon the Thebans from Orchomenus and Platæa.

This overwhelming sentence, in spite of an appeal for lenity by a Theban[2] named Kleadas, was passed by the Grecian auxiliaries of Alexander, and executed by Alexander himself, who made but one addition to the excepting clauses. He left the house of Pindar standing, and spared the descendants of the poet. With these reserves, Thebes was effaced from the earth. The Theban territory was partitioned among the reconstituted cities of Orchomenus and Platæa. Nothing, except the Macedonian military post at the Kadmeia, remained to mark the place where the chief of the Bœotian confederacy had once stood. The captives were all sold, and are said to have yielded 440 talents; large prices

[1] Arrian, i. 9; Diodor. xvii. 14.

[2] Justin, xi. 4.

being offered by bidders from feelings of hostility towards the city[1]. Diodorus tells us that this sentence was passed by the general synod of Greeks. But we are not called upon to believe that this synod, subservient though it was sure to be when called upon to deliberate under the armed force of Alexander, could be brought to sanction such a ruin upon one of the first and most ancient Hellenic cities. For we learn from Arrian that the question was discussed and settled only by the Grecian auxiliaries who had taken part with Alexander[2]; and that the sentence therefore represents the bitter antipathies of the Orchomenians, Platæans, &c. Without doubt, these cities had sustained harsh and cruel treatment from Thebes. In so far as they were concerned, the retribution upon the Thebans was merited. Those persons, however, who (as Arrian tells us) pronounced the catastrophe to be a divine judgement upon Thebes for having joined Xerxes against Greece[3] a century and a half before,—must have forgotten that not only the Orchomenians, but even Alexander of Macedon the namesake and predecessor of the destroying conqueror, had served in the army of Xerxes along with the Thebans.

Sentiments of Alexander, at the time and afterwards, respecting the destruction of Thebes.

Arrian vainly endeavours to transfer from Alexander to the minor Bœotian towns the odium of this cruel destruction—unparalleled in Grecian history

[1] Diodor. xvii. 14; Justin, xi. 4: "pretium non ex mentium commodo, sed ex inimicorum odio extenditur."

[2] Arrian, i. 9, 13. Τοῖς δὲ μετασχοῦσι τοῦ ἔργου ξυμμάχοις, οἷς δὴ καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν Ἀλέξανδρος τὰ κατὰ τὰς Θήβας διαθεῖναι, ἔδοξε, &c.

[3] Arrian, i. 9, 10. He informs us (i. 9, 12) that there were many previous portents which foreshadowed this ruin: Diodorus (xvii. 10), on the contrary, enumerates many previous signs, all tending to encourage the Thebans.

(as he himself says), when we look to the magnitude of the city; yet surpassed in the aggregate by the subversion, under the arms of Philip, of no less than thirty-two free Chalkidic cities, thirteen years before. The known antipathy of these Bœotians was invoked by Alexander to colour an infliction which satisfied at once his sentiment, by destroying an enemy who defied him—and his policy, by serving as a terrific example to keep down other Greeks[1]. But though such were the views which governed him at the moment, he came afterwards to look back upon the proceeding with shame and sorrow. The shock to Hellenic feeling, when a city was subverted, arose not merely from the violent extinction of life, property, liberty, and social or political institutions —but also from the obliteration of legends and the suppression of religious observances, thus wronging and provoking the local Gods and heroes. We shall presently find Alexander himself sacrificing at Ilium[2], in order to appease the wrath of Priam,

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 11. ἡ μὲν πόλις ἦλω καὶ διαρπασθεῖσα κατεσκάφη, τὸ μὲν ὅλον προσδοκήσαντος αὐτοῦ τοὺς Ἕλληνας πάθει πηλικούτῳ ἐκπλαγέντας καὶ πτήξαντας ἀτρεμήσειν, ἄλλως τε καὶ καλλωπισαμένου χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς τῶν συμμάχων ἐγκλήμασιν.

[2] Arrian, i. 11, 13. To illustrate farther the feeling of the Greeks, respecting the wrath of the Gods arising from the discontinuance of worship where it had been long continued—I transcribe a passage from Colonel Sleeman's work respecting the Hindoos, whose religious feelings are on so many points analogous to those of the Hellênes:—

"Human sacrifices were certainly offered in the city of Saugor during the whole Mahratta government, up to the year 1800—when they were put a stop to by the local governor, Assa Sahib, a very humane man. I once heard a learned Brahmin priest say, that he thought the decline of his (Assa Sahib's) family and government arose from this innovation. 'There is (said he) no sin in not offering human sacrifices to the Gods, where none have been offered; *but where the Gods have been accustomed to them, they are very naturally annoyed when the rite is abolished, and*

still subsisting and efficacious, against himself and his race, as being descended from Neoptolemus the slayer of Priam. By his harsh treatment of Thebes, he incurred the displeasure of Dionysus, the god of wine, said to have been born in that city, and one of the principal figures in Theban legend. It was to inspirations of the offended Dionysus that Alexander believed himself to owe that ungovernable drunken passion under which he afterwards killed Kleitus, as well as the refusal of his Macedonian soldiers to follow him farther into India[1]. If Alexander in after days thus repented of his own act, we may be sure that the like repugnance was felt still more strongly by others; and we can understand the sentiment under which, a few years after his decease, the Macedonian Kassander, son of Antipater, restored the destroyed city.

Extreme terror spread throughout Greece. Sympathy of the Athenians towards the Theban exiles.

At the time, however, the effect produced by the destruction of Thebes was one of unmitigated terror throughout the Grecian cities. All of them sought to make their peace with the conqueror. The Arcadian contingent not only returned home from the Isthmus, but even condemned their leaders to death. The Eleians recalled their chief macedonising

visit the place and people with all kinds of calamity.' The priest did not seem to think that there was anything singular in this mode of reasoning: perhaps three Brahmin priests out of four would have reasoned in the same manner." (Sleeman, Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official, vol. i. ch. xv. p. 130.)

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 13: compare Justin, xi. 4; and Isokrates ad Philipp. (Or. v. s. 35), where he recommends Thebes to Philip on the ground of pre-eminent worship towards Heraklês.

It deserves notice, that while Alexander himself repented of the destruction of Thebes, the macedonising orator at Athens describes it as a just, though deplorable penalty, brought by the Thebans upon themselves by reckless insanity of conduct (Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 524).

citizens out of exile into ascendency at home. Each tribe of Ætolians sent envoys to Alexander, entreating forgiveness for their manifestations against him. At Athens, we read with surprise that on the very day when Thebes was assaulted and taken, the great festival of Eleusinian Dêmêtêr, with its multitudinous procession of votaries from Athens to Eleusis, was actually taking place, at a distance of two days' march from the besieged city. Most Theban fugitives who contrived to escape, fled to Attica as the nearest place of refuge, communicating to the Athenians their own distress and terror. The festival was forthwith suspended. Every one hurried within the walls of Athens[1], carrying with him his moveable property into a state of security. Under the general alarm prevalent, that the conqueror would march directly into Attica, and under the hurry of preparation for defence,—the persons both most alarmed and most in real danger were, of course, Demosthenes, Lykurgus, Charidemus, and those others who had been loudest in speech against Macedonia, and had tried to prevail on the Athenians to espouse openly the cause of Thebes. Yet notwithstanding such terror of consequences to themselves, the Athenians afforded shelter and sympathy to the miserable Theban fugitives. They continued to do this even when they must have known that they were contravening the edict of proscription just sanctioned by Alexander.

Shortly afterwards, envoys arrived from that monarch with a menacing letter, formally demanding the surrender of eight or ten leading citizens of

[1] Arrian, i. 10, 4.

Alexander demands the surrender of the chief anti-Macedonian leaders at Athens. Memorable debate at Athens. The demand refused.

Athens—Demosthenes, Lykurgus, Hyperides, Polyeuktus, Mœroklês, Diotimus[1], Ephialtes, and Charidemus. Of these the first four were eminent orators, the last two military men; all strenuous advocates of an anti-Macedonian policy. Alexander in his letter denounced the ten as the causes of the battle of Chæroneia, of the offensive resolutions which had been adopted at Athens after the death of Philip, and even of the recent hostile proceedings of the Thebans[2]. This momentous summons, involving the right of free speech and public debate at Athens, was submitted to the assembly. A similar demand had just been made upon the Thebans, and the consequences of refusal were to be read no less plainly in the destruction of their city than in the threats of the conqueror. That even under such trying circumstances, neither orators nor people failed in courage—we know as a general fact; though we have not the advantage (as Livy had in his time) of reading the speeches made in the debate[3]. Demosthenes, insisting that the fate of the

[1] The name of Diotimus is mentioned by Arrian (i. 10, 6), but not by Plutarch; who names Demon instead of Hyperides. We know nothing about Diotimus, except that Demosthenes (De Coronâ, p. 264) alludes to him along with Charidemus as having received an expression of gratitude from the people, in requital for a present of shields which he had made. He is mentioned also, along with Charidemus and others, in the third of the Demosthenic epistles, p. 1482.

[2] Arrian, i. 10, 6; Plutarch, Vit. X. Orat. p. 847. ἐξῆτει αὐτὸν (Demosthenes) ἀπειλὼν εἰ μὴ δοίησαν. Diodor. xvii. 15; Plutarch, Demosth. 23.

[3] Livy, ix. 18. "(Alexander) adversus quem Athenis, in civitate fractâ Macedonum armis, cernente tum maxime prope fumantes Thebarum ruinas, concionari libere ausi sint homines,—id quod ex monumentis orationum patet," &c.

citizens generally could not be severed from that of the specific victims, is said to have recounted in the course of his speech, the old fable—of the wolf requiring the sheep to make over to him their protecting dogs, as a condition of peace—and then, devouring the unprotected sheep forthwith. He, and those demanded along with him, claimed the protection of the people, in whose cause alone they had incurred the wrath of the conqueror. Phokion on the other hand—silent at first, and rising only under constraint by special calls from the popular voice—contended that there was not force enough to resist Alexander, and that the persons in question must be given up. He even made appeal to themselves individually, reminding them of the self-devotion of the daughters of Erechtheus, memorable in Attic legend—and calling on them to surrender themselves voluntarily for the purpose of averting public calamity. He added, that he (Phokion) would rejoice to offer up either himself, or his best friend, if by such sacrifice he could save the city[1]. Lykurgus, one of the orators whose extradition was required, answered this speech of Phokion with vehemence and bitterness; and the public sentiment went along with him, indignantly repudiating Phokion's advice. By a resolute patriotism highly honourable at this trying juncture, it was decreed that the persons demanded should not be surrendered[2].

On the motion of Demades, an embassy was

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 9-17; Diodor. xvii. 15.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 15. Ὁ δὲ δῆμος τοῦτον μὲν (Phokion) τοῖς θορύβοις ἐξέβαλε, προσάντως ἀκούων τοὺς λόγους.

Embassy of the Athenians to Alexander. He is persuaded to acquiesce in the refusal, and to be satisfied with the banishment of Charidemus and Ephialtes.

sent to Alexander, deprecating his wrath against the ten, and engaging to punish them by judicial sentence, if any crime could be proved against them. Demades, who is said to have received from Demosthenes a bribe of five talents, undertook this mission. But Alexander was at first inexorable; refusing even to hear the envoys, and persisting in his requisition. It was only by the intervention of a second embassy, headed by Phokion, that a remission of terms was obtained. Alexander was persuaded to withdraw his requisition, and to be satisfied with the banishment of Charidemus and Ephialtes, the two anti-Macedonian military leaders. Both of them accordingly, and seemingly other Athenians with them, passed into Asia, where they took service under Darius[1].

[1] Arrian, i. 10, 8; Diodor. xvii. 15; Plutarch, Phokion, 17; Justin, xi. 4; Deinarchus cont. Demosth. p. 26.

Arrian states that the visit of Demades with nine other Athenian envoys to Alexander, occurred *prior* to the demand of Alexander for the extradition of the ten citizens. He (Arrian) affirms that immediately on hearing the capture of Thebes, the Athenians passed a vote, on the motion of Demades, to send ten envoys, for the purpose of expressing satisfaction that Alexander had come home safely from the Illyrians, and that he had punished the Thebans for their revolt. Alexander (according to Arrian) received this mission courteously, but replied by sending a letter to the Athenian people, insisting on the surrender of the ten citizens.

Now both Diodorus and Plutarch represent the mission of Demades as *posterior* to the demand made by Alexander for the ten citizens; and that it was intended to meet and deprecate that demand.

In my judgement, Arrian's tale is the less credible of the two. I think it highly improbable that the Athenians would by public vote express satisfaction that Alexander had punished the Thebans for their revolt. If the macedonising party at Athens was strong enough to carry so ignominious a vote, they would also have been strong enough to carry the subsequent proposition of Phokion—that the ten citizens

It was indeed no part of Alexander's plan to undertake a siege of Athens, which might prove long and difficult, since the Athenians had a superior naval force, with the sea open to them, and the chance of effective support from Persia. When therefore he saw, that his demand for the ten orators would be firmly resisted, considerations of policy gradually overcame his wrath, and induced him to relax.

Influence of Phokion in obtaining these milder terms—his increased ascendency at Athens.

Phokion returned to Athens as the bearer of Alexander's concessions, thus relieving the Athenians from extreme anxiety and peril. His influence—already great and of long standing, since for years past he had been perpetually re-elected general—became greater than ever, while that of Demosthenes and the other anti-Macedonian orators must have been lowered. It was no mean advantage to Alexander, victorious as he was, to secure the incorruptible Phokion as leader of the macedonising party at Athens. His projects against Persia were mainly exposed to failure from the possibility of opposition being raised against him in Greece by the agency of Persian money and ships. To keep Athens out of such combinations, he had to rely upon the personal influence and party of Phokion, whom he knew to have always dissuaded her from resistance to the ever-growing aggrandisement of his father Philip. In his conversation with Phokion on the intended Asiatic expedition, Alex-

demanded should be surrendered. The fact, that the Athenians afforded willing shelter to the Theban fugitives, is a farther reason for disbelieving this alleged vote.

ander took some pains to flatter the pride of Athens by describing her as second only to himself, and as entitled to the headship of Greece, in case any thing should happen to him[1]. Such compliments were suitable to be repeated in the Athenian assembly: indeed the Macedonian prince might naturally prefer the idea of Athenian headship to that of Spartan, seeing that Sparta stood aloof from him, an open recusant.

B.C. 335, autumn. Alexander at Corinth —obedience of the Grecian synod—interview with the philosopher Diogenes.

The animosity of Alexander being appeased, Athens resumed her position as a member of the confederacy under his imperial authority. Without visiting Attica, he now marched to the Isthmus of Corinth, where he probably received from various Grecian cities deputations deprecating his displeasure, and proclaiming their submission to his imperial authority. He also probably presided at a meeting of the Grecian synod, where he would dictate the contingents required for his intended Asiatic expedition in the ensuing spring. To the universal deference and submission which greeted him, one exception was found—the Cynic philosopher Diogenes, who resided at Corinth, satisfied with a tub for shelter, and with the coarsest and most self-denying existence. Alexander approached him with a numerous suite, and asked him if he wished for anything; upon which Diogenes is said to have replied,—"Nothing, except that you would stand a little out of my sunshine." Both the philosopher and his reply provoked laughter from the bystanders, but Alexander himself was so

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 17; Plutarch, Alexand. 13.

impressed with the independent and self-sufficing character manifested, that he exclaimed,—"If I were not Alexander, I would be Diogenes[1]."

B.C. 335–334, winter. Re-constitution of Orchomenus and Platæa. Return of Alexander to Pella.

Having visited the oracle of Delphi, and received or extorted from the priestess[2] an answer bearing favourable promise for his Asiatic schemes, he returned to Macedonia before the winter. The most important permanent effect of his stay in Greece was the re-constitution of Bœotia; that is, the destruction of Thebes, and the reconstitution of Orchomenus, Thespiæ, and Platæa, dividing between them the Theban territory; all guarded and controlled by a Macedonian garrison in the Kadmeia. It would have been interesting to learn some details about this process of destruction and restitution of the Bœotian towns; a process not only calling forth strong manifestations of sentiment, but also involving important and difficult questions to settle. But unfortunately we are not permitted to know anything beyond the general fact.

Alexander left Greece for Pella in the autumn of 335 B.C., and never saw it again.

B.C. 335. Military operations of Parmenio in Asia Minor against Memnon.

It appears, that during this summer, while he was occupied in his Illyrian and Theban operations, the Macedonian force under Parmenio in Asia had had to contend against a Persian army, or Greek mercenaries, commanded by Memnon the Rhodian. Parmenio, marching into Æolis, besieged and took Grynium; after which he attacked Pitanê, but was compelled by Memnon to raise the siege. Memnon even gained a victory over the Macedonian force under Kallas in the Troad, compelling them to

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 14.

[2] Plutarch, Alex. 14.

retire to Rhœteum. But he failed in an attempt to surprise Kyzikus, and was obliged to content himself with plundering the adjoining territory[1]. It is affirmed that Darius was engaged this summer in making large preparations, naval as well as military, to resist the intended expedition of Alexander. Yet all that we hear of what was actually done implies nothing beyond a moderate force.

[1] Diodor. xvi. 7.

CHAPTER XCII.

ASIATIC CAMPAIGNS OF ALEXANDER.

B.C. 335–334.

A YEAR and some months had sufficed for Alexander to make a first display of his energy and military skill, destined for achievements yet greater; and to crush the growing aspirations for freedom among Greeks on the south, as well as among Thracians on the north, of Macedonia. The ensuing winter was employed in completing his preparations; so that early in the spring of 334 B.C., his army destined for the conquest of Asia was mustered between Pella and Amphipolis, while his fleet was at hand to lend support.

During Alexander's reign, the history of Greece is nearly a blank.

The whole of Alexander's remaining life—from his crossing the Hellespont in March or April 334 B.C. to his death at Babylon in June 323 B.C., eleven years and two or three months—was passed in Asia, amidst unceasing military operations, and ever-multiplied conquests. He never lived to revisit Macedonia; but his achievements were on so transcendent a scale, his acquisitions of territory so unmeasured, and his thirst for farther aggrandisement still so insatiate, that Macedonia sinks into insignificance in the list of his possessions. Much more do the Grecian cities dwindle into outlying appendages of a newly-grown Oriental empire. During all these eleven years, the history of Greece is almost a blank, except here and there a few scattered events.

It is only at the death of Alexander that the Grecian cities again awaken into active movement.

To what extent the Asiatic projects of Alexander belonged to Grecian history.

The Asiatic conquests of Alexander do not belong directly and literally to the province of an historian of Greece. They were achieved by armies of which the general, the principal officers, and most part of the soldiers, were Macedonian. The Greeks who served with him were only auxiliaries, along with the Thracians and Pæonians. Though more numerous than all the other auxiliaries, they did not constitute, like the Ten Thousand Greeks in the army of the younger Cyrus, the force on which he mainly relied for victory. His chief-secretary, Eumenes of Kardia, was a Greek, and probably most of the civil and intellectual functions connected with the service were also performed by Greeks. Many Greeks also served in the army of Persia against him, and composed indeed a larger proportion of the real force (disregarding mere numbers) in the army of Darius than in that of Alexander. Hence the expedition becomes indirectly incorporated with the stream of Grecian history by the powerful auxiliary agency of Greeks on both sides—and still more, by its connexion with previous projects, dreams, and legends, long antecedent to the aggrandisement of Macedon—as well as by the character which Alexander thought fit to assume. To take revenge on Persia for the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, and to liberate the Asiatic Greeks, had been the scheme of the Spartan Agesilaus, and of the Pheræan Jason; with hopes grounded on the memorable expedition and safe return of the Ten Thousand. It had been recommended by the rhetor Isokrates, first to the

combined force of Greece, while yet Grecian cities were free, under the joint headship of Athens and Sparta—next, to Philip of Macedon as the chief of united Greece, when his victorious arms had extorted a recognition of headship, setting aside both Athens and Sparta. The enterprising ambition of Philip was well pleased to be nominated chief of Greece for the execution of this project. From him it passed to his yet more ambitious son.

Pan-hellenic pretences set up by Alexander. The real feeling of the Greeks was adverse to his success.

Though really a scheme of Macedonian appetite and for Macedonian aggrandisement, the expedition against Asia thus becomes thrust into the series of Grecian events, under the Pan-hellenic pretence of retaliation for the long past insults of Xerxes. I call it a *pretence*, because it had ceased to be a real Hellenic feeling, and served now two different purposes; first, to ennoble the undertaking in the eyes of Alexander himself, whose mind was very accessible to religious and legendary sentiment, and who willingly identified himself with Agamemnon or Achilles, immortalised as executors of the collective vengeance of Greece for Asiatic insult—next, to assist in keeping the Greeks quiet during his absence. He was himself aware that the real sympathies of the Greeks were rather adverse than favourable to his success.

Analogy of Alexander's relation to the Greeks—with those of the Emperor Napoleon to the Confederation of the Rhine.

Apart from this body of extinct sentiment, ostentatiously rekindled for Alexander's purposes, the position of the Greeks in reference to his Asiatic conquests was very much the same as that of the German contingents, especially those of the Confederation of the Rhine, who served in the grand army with which the Emperor Napoleon invaded

Russia in 1812. They had no public interest in the victory of the invader, which could end only by reducing them to still greater prostration. They were likely to adhere to their leader as long as his power continued unimpaired, but no longer. Yet Napoleon thought himself entitled to reckon upon them as if they had been Frenchmen, and to denounce the Germans in the service of Russia as traitors who had forfeited the allegiance which they owed to him. We find him drawing the same pointed distinction between the Russian and the German prisoners taken, as Alexander made between Asiatic and Grecian prisoners. These Grecian prisoners the Macedonian prince reproached as guilty of treason against the proclaimed statute of collective Hellas, whereby he had been declared general, and the Persian king a public enemy[1].

[1] Arrian, i. 16, 10; i. 29, 9, about the Grecian prisoners taken at the victory of the Granikus—*ὅσους δὲ αὐτῶν αἰχμαλώτους ἔλαβε, τούτους δὲ δήσας ἐν πέδαις, εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἀπέπεμψεν ἐργάζεσθαι, ὅτι παρὰ τὰ κοινῇ δόξαντα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, Ἕλληνες ὄντες, ἐνάντια τῇ Ἑλλάδι ὑπὲρ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐμάχοντο.* Also iii. 23, 15, about the Grecian soldiers serving with the Persians, and made prisoners in Hyrkania—*Ἀδικεῖν γὰρ μέγαλα* (said Alexander) *τοὺς στρατευομένους ἐνάντια τῇ Ἑλλάδι παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάροις παρὰ τὰ δόγματα τῶν Ἑλλήνων.*

Toward the end of October 1812, near Moscow, General Winzingerode, a German officer in the Russian service,—with his aide-de-camp a native Russian, Narishkin,—became prisoner of the French. He was brought to Napoleon—"At the sight of that German general, all the secret resentments of Napoleon took fire. 'Who are you (he exclaimed)? a man without country! When I was at war with the Austrians, I found you in their ranks. Austria has become my ally, and you have entered into the Russian service. You have been one of the warmest instigators of the present war. Nevertheless, you are a native of the Confederation of the Rhine: *you are my subject.* You are not an ordinary enemy: you are a rebel: I have a right to bring you to trial. *Gens d'armes,* seize this man!' Then addressing the aide-de-camp of Winzingerode, Napoleon said, 'As for you, Count Narishkin, I have

Hellas, as a political aggregate, has now ceased to exist, except in so far as Alexander employs the name for his own purposes. Its component members are annexed as appendages, doubtless of considerable value, to the Macedonian kingdom. Fourteen years before Alexander's accession, Demosthenes, while instigating the Athenians to uphold Olynthus against Philip, had told them[1]—"The Macedonian power, considered as an appendage, is of no mean value; but by itself, it is weak and full of embarrassments." Inverting the position of the parties, these words represent exactly what Greece herself had become, in reference to Macedonia and Persia, at the time of Alexander's accession. Had the Persians played their game with tolerable prudence and vigour, his success would have been measured by the degree to which he could appropriate Grecian force to himself, and withhold it from his enemy.

Greece an appendage, but a valuable appendage, to Macedonia.

Alexander's memorable and illustrious manifestations, on which we are now entering, are those, not of the ruler or politician, but of the general and the soldier. In this character his appearance forms a sort of historical epoch. It is not merely in soldier-like qualities—in the most forward and even adventurous bravery—in indefatigable personal activity,

Extraordinary military endowments and capacity of Alexander.

nothing to reproach you with: you are a Russian, you are doing your duty.'" (Ségur's account of the Campaign in Russia, book ix. ch. vi. p. 132.)

Napoleon did not realise these threats against Winzingerode; but his language expresses just the same sentiment as that of Alexander towards the captive Greeks.

[1] Demosth. Olynth. ii. p. 14. Ὅλως μὲν γὰρ ἡ Μακεδονικὴ δύναμις καὶ ἀρχὴ ἐν μὲν προσθήκης μέρει ἐστί τις οὐ σμικρὰ, οἷον ὑπῆρξέ ποθ' ὑμῖν ἐπὶ Τιμοθέου πρὸς Ὀλυνθίους..... ...αὐτὴ δὲ καθ' αὑτὴν ἀσθενὴς καὶ πολλῶν κακῶν ἐστὶ μεστή.

and in endurance as to hardship and fatigue,—that he stands pre-eminent; though these qualities alone, when found in a king, act so powerfully on those under his command, that they suffice to produce great achievements, even when combined with generalship not surpassing the average of his age. But in generalship, Alexander was yet more above the level of his contemporaries. His strategic combinations, his employment of different descriptions of force conspiring towards one end, his long-sighted plans for the prosecution of campaigns, his constant foresight and resource against new difficulties, together with rapidity of movement even in the worst country—all on a scale of prodigious magnitude—are without parallel in ancient history. They carry the art of systematic and scientific warfare to a degree of efficiency, such as even successors trained in his school were unable to keep up unimpaired.

Changes in Grecian warfare, antecedent and contributory to the military organization of Macedonia.

We must recollect however that Alexander found the Macedonian military system built up by Philip, and had only to apply and enlarge it. As transmitted to him, it embodied the accumulated result and matured fruit of a series of successive improvements, applied by Grecian tacticians to the primitive Hellenic arrangements. During the sixty years before the accession of Alexander, the art of war had been conspicuously progressive—to the sad detriment of Grecian political freedom. "Everything around us (says Demosthenes addressing the people of Athens in 342 B.C.) has been in advance for some years past—nothing is like what it was formerly—but nowhere is the alteration and enlargement more conspicuous than in the affairs of

war. Formerly, the Lacedæmonians as well as other Greeks did nothing more than invade each other's territory, during the four or five summer months, with their native force of citizen hoplites: in winter they stayed at home. But now we see Philip in constant action, winter as well as summer, attacking all around him, not merely with Macedonian hoplites, but with cavalry, light infantry, bowmen, foreigners of all descriptions, and siege-batteries[1]."

I have in my last two volumes dwelt upon this progressive change in the character of Grecian soldiership. At Athens, and in most other parts of Greece, the burghers had become averse to hard and active military service. The use of arms had passed mainly to professional soldiers, who, without any feeling of citizenship, served wherever good pay was offered, and became immensely multiplied, to the detriment and danger of Grecian society[2]. Many of these mercenaries were lightly armed—peltasts served in combination with the hoplites[3]. Iphikrates greatly improved and partly re-armed the peltasts; whom he employed conjointly with hoplites so effectively as to astonish

[1] Demosth. Philipp. iii. p. 123, 124: compare Olynth. ii. p. 22. I give here the substance of what is said by the orator, not strictly adhering to his words.

[2] Isokrates, in several of his discourses, notes the gradual increase of these mercenaries—men without regular means of subsistence, or fixed residence, or civic obligations. Or. iv. (Panegyr.) s. 195; Or. v. (Philippus), s. 112-142; Or. viii. (De Pace), s. 31-56.

[3] Xenoph. Magist. Equit. ix. 4. Οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις τὸ ἱππικὸν ἀρξάμενον εὐδοκιμεῖν, ἐπεὶ ξένους ἱππέας προσελαβον· καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι πανταχοῦ τὰ ξενικὰ ὁρῶ εὐδοκιμοῦντα.

Compare Demosth. Philippic. i. p. 46; Xenoph. Hellenic. iv. 4, 14; Isokrates, Orat. vii. (Areopagit.), s. 93.

his contemporaries[1]. His innovation was farther developed by the great military genius of Epaminondas; who not only made infantry and cavalry, light-armed and heavy-armed, conspire to one scheme of operations, but also completely altered the received principles of battle-manœuvring, by concentrating an irresistible force of attack on one point of the enemy's line, and keeping the rest of his own line more on the defensive. Besides these important improvements, realised by generals in actual practice, intelligent officers like Xenophon embodied the results of their military experience in valuable published criticisms[2]. Such were the lessons which the Macedonian Philip learnt and applied to the enslavement of those Greeks, especially of the Thebans, from whom they were derived. In his youth, as a hostage at Thebes, he

[1] For an explanation of the improved arming of peltasts introduced by Iphikrates, see Vol. IX. Ch. lxxv. p. 467 of this History. Respecting these improvements, the statements both of Diodorus (xv. 44) and of Nepos are obscure. MM. Rüstow and Köchly (in their valuable work, Geschichte des Griechischen Kriegswesens, Aarau, 1852, B. ii. p. 164) have interpreted the statements in a sense to which I cannot subscribe. They think that Iphikrates altered not only the arming of peltasts, but also that of hoplites; a supposition, which I see nothing to justify.

[2] Besides the many scattered remarks in the Anabasis, the Cyropædia is full of discussion and criticism on military phænomena. It is remarkable to what an extent Xenophon had present to his mind all the exigences of war, and the different ways of meeting them. See as an example, Cyropæd. vi. 2; ii. 1.

The work on sieges, by Æneas (Poliorketica), is certainly anterior to the military improvements of Philip of Macedon: probably about the beginning of his reign. See the preface to it by Rüstow and Köchly, p. 8, in their edition of Die Griechischen Kriegs-schriftsteller, Leips. 1853. In this work, allusion is made to several others, now lost, by the same author—Παρασκευαστικὴ βίβλος, Ποριστικὴ βίβλος, Στρατοπεδευτικὴ, &c.

had probably conversed with Epaminondas, and must certainly have become familiar with the Theban military arrangements. He had every motive, not merely from ambition of conquest, but even from the necessities of defence, to turn them to account: and he brought to the task military genius and aptitude of the highest order. In arms, in evolutions, in engines, in regimenting, in war-office arrangements, he introduced important novelties; bequeathing to his successors the Macedonian military system, which, with improvements by his son, lasted until the conquest of the country by Rome, near two centuries afterwards.

Macedonian military condition before Philip. Good and firm cavalry: poor infantry.

The military force of Macedonia, in the times anterior to Philip, appears to have consisted, like that of Thessaly, in a well-armed and well-mounted cavalry, formed from the substantial proprietors of the country—and in a numerous assemblage of peltasts or light infantry (somewhat analogous to the Thessalian Penestæ): these latter were the rural population, shepherds or cultivators, who tended sheep and cattle, or tilled the earth, among the spacious mountains and valleys of Upper Macedonia. The Grecian towns near the coast, and the few Macedonian towns in the interior, had citizen-hoplites better armed; but foot-service was not in honour among the natives, and the Macedonian infantry in their general character were hardly more than a rabble. At the period of Philip's accession, they were armed with nothing better than rusty swords and wicker shields, noway sufficient to make head against the inroads of their Thracian and Illyrian neighbours; before whom they were constantly

compelled to flee for refuge up to the mountains[1]. Their condition was that of poor herdsmen, half-naked or covered only with hides, and eating from wooden platters: not much different from that of the population of Upper Macedonia three centuries before, when first visited by Perdikkas the ancestor of the Macedonian kings, and when the wife of the native prince baked bread with her own hands[2]. On the other hand, though the Macedonian infantry was thus indifferent, the cavalry of the country was excellent, both in the Peloponnesian war, and in the war carried on by Sparta against Olynthus more than twenty years afterwards[3]. These horsemen, like the Thessalians, charged in compact order, carrying as their principal weapon of offence, not javelins to be hurled, but the short thrusting-pike for close combat.

Thus defective was the military organization which Philip found. Under his auspices it was

[1] See the striking speech addressed by Alexander to the discontented Macedonian soldiers, a few months before his death, at Opis or Susa (Arrian, vii. 9).

.....Φίλιππος γὰρ παραλαβὼν ὑμᾶς πλανήτας καὶ ἀπόρους, ἐν διφθέραις τοὺς πολλοὺς νέμοντας ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη πρόβατα κατὰ ὀλιγα, καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων κακῶς μαχομένους Ἰλλυριοῖς τε καὶ Τριβαλλοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὁμόροις Θρᾳξί, χλαμύδας μὲν ὑμῖν ἀντὶ τῶν διφθερῶν φορεῖν ἔδωκε, κατήγαγε δὲ ἐκ τῶν ὀρῶν ἐς τὰ πεδία, ἀξιομάχους καταστήσας τοῖς προσχώροις τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς μὴ χωρίων ἔτι ὀχυρότητι πιστεύοντας μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ οἰκείᾳ ἀρετῇ σώζεσθαι.....

In the version of the same speech given by Curtius (x. 10, 23), we find, "Modo sub Philippo seminudis, amicula ex purpurâ sordent, aurum et argentum oculi ferre non possunt: lignea enim vasa desiderant, et ex cratibus scuta rubiginemque gladiorum," &c.

Compare the description given by Thucydides, iv. 124, of the army of Brasidas and Perdikkas, where the Macedonian foot are described as ἄλλος ὅμιλος τῶν βαρβάρων πολύς.

[2] Herodot. viii. 137.

[3] Thucyd. ii. 100; Xenoph. Hellen. v. 2, 40-42.

cast altogether anew. The poor and hardy Landwehr of Macedonia, constantly on the defensive against predatory neighbours, formed an excellent material for soldiers, and proved not intractable to the innovations of a warlike prince. They were placed under constant training in the regular rank and file of heavy infantry: they were moreover brought to adopt a new description of arm, not only in itself very difficult to manage, but also comparatively useless to the soldier when fighting single-handed, and only available by a body of men in close order, trained to move or stand together. The new weapon, of which we first hear the name in the army of Philip, was the sarissa—the Macedonian pike or lance. The sarissa was used both by the infantry of his phalanx, and by particular regiments of his cavalry; in both cases it was long, though that of the phalanx was much the longer of the two. The regiments of cavalry called Sarissophori or Lancers were a sort of light-horse, carrying a long lance, and distinguished from the heavier cavalry intended for the shock of hand combat, who carried the xyston or short pike. The sarissa of this cavalry may have been fourteen feet in length, as long as the Cossack pike now is; that of the infantry in phalanx was not less than twenty-one feet long. This dimension is so prodigious and so unwieldy, that we should hardly believe it, if it did not come attested by the distinct assertion of an historian like Polybius.

Philip rearms and re-organises the infantry. Long Macedonian pike or sarissa.

The extraordinary reach of the sarissa or pike constituted the prominent attribute and force of the Macedonian phalanx. The phalangites were drawn up in files generally of sixteen deep, each called a

Macedonian phalanx—how armed and arrayed.

Lochus; with an interval of three feet between each two soldiers from front to rear. In front stood the lochage, a man of superior strength, and of tried military experience. The second and third men in the file, as well as the rearmost man who brought up the whole, were also picked soldiers, receiving larger pay than the rest. Now the sarissa, when in horizontal position, was held with both hands (distinguished in this respect from the pike of the Grecian hoplite, which occupied only one hand, the other being required for the shield), and so held that it projected fifteen feet before the body of the pikeman; while the hinder portion of six feet was so weighted as to make the pressure convenient in such division. Hence, the sarissa of the man standing second in the file, projected twelve feet beyond the front rank; that of the third man, nine feet; those of the fourth and fifth ranks, respectively six feet and three feet. There was thus presented a quintuple series of pikes by each file, to meet an advancing enemy. Of these five, the three first would be decidedly of greater projection, and even the fourth of not less projection, than the pikes of Grecian hoplites coming up as enemies to the charge. The ranks behind the fifth, while serving to sustain and press onward the front, did not carry the sarissa in a horizontal position, but slanted it over the shoulders of those before them, so as to break the force of any darts or arrows which might be shot over head from the rear ranks of the enemy[1].

The phalangite (soldier of the phalanx) was farther

[1] Respecting the length of the pike of the Macedonian phalanx, see Appendix to this Chapter.

provided with a short sword, a circular shield of rather more than two feet in diameter, a breast-piece, leggings, and a kausia or broad-brimmed-hat—the head-covering common in the Macedonian army. But the long pikes were in truth the main weapons of defence as well as of offence. They were destined to contend against the charge of Grecian hoplites with the one-handed pike and heavy shield; especially against the most formidable manifestation of that force, the deep Theban column organised by Epaminondas. This was what Philip had to deal with, at his accession, as the irresistible infantry of Greece, bearing down every thing before it by thrust of pike and propulsion of shield. He provided the means of vanquishing it, by training his poor Macedonian infantry to the systematic use of the long two-handed pike. The Theban column, charging a phalanx so armed, found themselves unable to break into the array of protended pikes, or to come to push of shield. We are told that at the battle of Chæroneia, the front rank Theban soldiers, the chosen men of the city, all perished on the ground; and this is not wonderful, when we conceive them as rushing, by their own courage as well as by the pressure upon them from behind, upon a wall of pikes double the length of their own. We must look at Philip's phalanx with reference to the enemies before him, not with reference to the later Roman organization, which Polybius brings into comparison. It answered perfectly the purposes of Philip, who wanted it mainly to stand the shock in front, thus overpowering Grecian hoplites in their own mode of attack. Now Polybius informs us,

It was originally destined to contend against the Grecian hoplites as organised by Epaminondas.

that the phalanx was never once beaten, in front and on ground suitable for it; and wherever the ground was fit for hoplites, it was also fit for the phalanx. The inconveniences of Philip's array, and of the long pikes, arose from the incapacity of the phalanx to change its front or keep its order on unequal ground; but such inconveniences were hardly less felt by Grecian hoplites[1].

Regiments and divisions of the phalanx—heavy-armed infantry.

The Macedonian phalanx, denominated the Pezetæri[2] or Foot Companions of the King, comprised the general body of native infantry, as distinguished from special *corps d'armée*. The largest division of it which we find mentioned under Alexander, and which appears under the command of a general of division, is called a Taxis. How many of these Taxeis there were in all, we do not know; the original Asiatic army of Alexander (apart from what he left at home) included six of them, coinciding apparently with the provincial allotments of the

[1] The impression of admiration, and even terror, with which the Roman general Paulus Emilius was seized, on first seeing the Macedonian phalanx in battle array at Pydna—has been recorded by Polybius (Polybius, Fragm. xxix. 6, 11; Livy, xlv. 40).

[2] Harpokration and Photius, v. Πεζέταιροι, Demosth. Olynth. ii. p. 23; Arrian, iv. 23, 1. τῶν πεζεταίρων καλουμένων τὰς Τάξεις, and ii. 23, 2, &c.

Since we know from Demosthenes that the pezetæri date from the time of Philip, it is probable that the passage of Anaximenes (as cited by Harpokration and Photius) which refers them to Alexander, has ascribed to the son what really belongs to the father. The term ἑταῖροι, in reference to the kings of Macedonia, first appears in Plutarch, Pelopidas, 27, in reference to Ptolemy, before the time of Philip: see Otto Abel, Makedonien vor König Philip, p. 129 (the passage of Ælian referred to by him seems of little moment). The term Companions or Comrades had under Philip a meaning purely military, designating foreigners as well as Macedonians serving in his army: see Theopompus, Frag. 249. The term, originally applied only to a select few, was by degrees extended to the corps generally.

country: Orestæ, Lynkestæ, Elimiotæ, Tymphæi, &c.[1]. The writers on tactics give us a systematic scale of distribution (ascending from the lowest unit, the Lochus of sixteen men, by successive multiples of two, up to the quadruple phalanx of 16,384 men) as pervading the Macedonian army. Among these divisions, that which stands out as most fundamental and constant, is the Syntagma, which contained sixteen Lochi. Forming thus a square of sixteen men in front and depth, or 256 men, it was at the same time a distinct aggregate or permanent battalion, having attached to it five supernumeraries, an ensign, a rear-man, a trumpeter, a herald, and an attendant or orderly[2]. Two of these Syntagmas composed a body of 512 men, called a Pentakosiarchy, which in Philip's time is said to have been the ordinary regiment, acting together under a separate command; but several of these were doubled by Alexander when he reorganized his army at Susa[3], so as to form regiments of 1024 men, each under its Chiliarch, and each comprising four Syntagmas. All this systematic distribution of the Macedonian military force when at home, appears to have been arranged by the genius of Philip. On

[1] Arrian, i. 14, 3. iii. 16, 19; Diodor. xvii. 57. Compare the note of Schmieder on the above passage of Arrian; also Droysen, Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen, p. 95, 96, and the elaborate note of Mützel on Curtius, v. 2, 3. p. 400.

The passage of Arrian (his description of Alexander's army arrayed at the Granikus) is confused, and seems erroneous in some words of the text; yet it may be held to justify the supposition of six taxeis of pezetæri in Alexander's phalanx on that day. There seem also to be six Taxeis at Arbêla (iii. 11, 16).

[2] Arrian, Tactic. c. 10; Ælian, Tactic. c. 9.

[3] Curtius, v. 2, 3.

actual foreign service, no numerical precision could be observed; a regiment or a division could not always contain the same fixed number of men. But as to the array, a depth of sixteen, for the files of the phalangites, appears to have been regarded as important and characteristic[1], perhaps essential to impart a feeling of confidence to the troops. It was a depth much greater than was common with Grecian hoplites, and never surpassed by any Greeks except the Thebans.

Light infantry of the line—Hypaspistæ, or Guards.

But the phalanx, though an essential item, was yet only one among many, in the varied military organization introduced by Philip. It was neither intended, nor fit, to act alone; being clumsy in changing front to protect itself either in flank or rear, and unable to adapt itself to uneven ground. There was another description of infantry organized by Philip called the Hypaspists—shield-bearers or Guards[2]; originally few in number, and employed for personal defence of the prince—but afterwards enlarged into several distinct *corps d'armée*. These Hypaspists or Guards were light infantry of the line[3]; they were hoplites, keeping regular array and intended for close combat, but more lightly armed,

[1] This is to be seen in the arrangements made by Alexander a short time before his death, when he incorporated Macedonian and Persian soldiers in the same lochus; the normal depth of sixteen was retained; all the front ranks or privileged men being Macedonians. The Macedonians were much hurt at seeing their native regimental array shared with Asiatics (Arrian, vii. 11, 5; vii. 23, 4–8).

[2] The proper meaning of ὑπασπισταί, as guards or personal attendants on the prince, appears in Arrian, i. 5, 3; vii. 8, 6.

Neoptolemus, as ἀρχιυπασπιστής to Alexander, carried the shield and lance of the latter, on formal occasions (Plutarch, Eumenes, 1).

[3] Arrian, ii. 4, 3, 4; ii. 20, 5.

and more fit for diversities of circumstance and position, than the phalanx. They seem to have fought with the one-handed pike and shield, like the Greeks; and not to have carried the two-handed phalangite pike or sarissa. They occupied a sort of intermediate place between the heavy infantry of the phalanx properly so called—and the peltasts and light troops generally. Alexander in his later campaigns had them distributed into Chiliarchies (how the distribution stood earlier, we have no distinct information), at least three in number, and probably more[1]. We find them employed by him in forward and aggressive movements; first his light troops and cavalry begin the attack; next the hypaspists come to follow it up; lastly, the phalanx is brought up to support them. The hypaspists are used also for assault of walled places, and for rapid night marches[2]. What was the total number of them, we do not know[3].

Light troops generally—mostly foreigners.

Besides the phalanx, and the hypaspists or Guards, the Macedonian army as employed by Philip and Alexander included a numerous assemblage of desultory or irregular troops, partly native Macedonians, partly foreigners, Thracians, Pæonians, &c. They were of different descriptions; peltasts, darters, and bowmen. The best of them appear to have been the Agriânes, a Pæonian tribe

[1] Arrian, iv. 30, 11; v. 23, 11.

[2] Arrian, ii. 20, 5; ii. 23, 6; iii. 18, 8.

[3] Droysen and Schmieder give the number of hypaspists in Alexander's army at Issus, as 6000. That this opinion rests on no sufficient evidence, has been shown by Mützel (ad Curtium, v. 2, 3. p. 399). But that the number of hypaspists left by Philip at his death was 6000 seems not improbable.

expert in the use of the javelin. All of them were kept in vigorous movement by Alexander, on the flanks and in front of his heavy infantry, or intermingled with his cavalry,—as well as for pursuit after the enemy was defeated.

Macedonian cavalry—its excellence—how regimented.

Lastly, the cavalry in Alexander's army was also admirable—at least equal, and seemingly even superior in efficiency, to his best infantry[1]. I have already mentioned that cavalry was the choice native force of Macedonia, long before the reign of Philip; by whom it had been extended and improved[2]. The heavy cavalry, wholly or chiefly composed of native Macedonians, was known by the denomination of the Companions. There was besides a new and lighter variety of cavalry, apparently introduced by Philip, and called the Sarissophori, or Lancers, used like Cossacks for advanced posts or scouring the country. The sarissa which they carried was probably much shorter than that of the phalanx; but it was long, if compared with the xyston or thrusting pike used by the heavy cavalry for the shock of close combat. Arrian, in describing the army of Alexander at Arbêla, enumerates eight distinct squadrons of this heavy cavalry—or cavalry of the Companions; but the total number included in the Macedonian army at Alexander's accession, is not

[1] See Arrian, v. 14, 1; v. 16, 4; Curtius, vi. 9, 22. "Equitatui, optimæ exercitûs parti," &c.

[2] We are told that Philip, after his expedition against the Scythians about three years before his death, exacted and sent into Macedonia 20,000 chosen mares, in order to improve the breed of Macedonian horses. The regal haras were in the neighbourhood of Pella (Justin, ix. 2; Strabo, xvi. p. 752, in which passage of Strabo, *the details* apply to the *haras* of Seleukus Nikator at Apameia, not to that of Philip at Pella).

known. Among the squadrons, several at least (if not all) were named after particular towns or districts of the country—Bottiæa, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Anthemus, &c.[1]; there was one or more, distinguished as the Royal Squadron—the Agêma or leading body of cavalry—at the head of which Alexander generally charged, himself among the foremost of the actual combatants[2].

The distribution of the cavalry into squadrons was that which Alexander found at his accession; but he altered it, when he remodelled the arrangements of his army (in 330 B.C.) at Susa, so as to subdivide the squadron into two Lochi, and to establish the Lochus for the elementary division of cavalry, as it had always been of infantry[3]. His reforms went thus to cut down the primary body of cavalry from the squadron to the half-squadron or Lochus, while they tended to bring the infantry together into larger bodies—from cohorts of 500 each to cohorts of 1000 men each.

Among the Hypaspists or Guards, also, we find

[1] Arrian, i. 2, 8, 9 (where we also find mentioned *τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἄνωθεν Μακεδονίας ἱππέας*), i. 12, 12; ii. 9, 6; iii. 11, 12.

About the *ἱππεῖς σαρισσόφοροι*, see i. 13, 1.

It is possible that there may have been sixteen squadrons of heavy cavalry, and eight squadrons of the Sarissophori,—each squadron from 180 to 250 men—as Rüstow and Köchly conceive (p. 243). But there is no sufficient evidence to prove it; nor can I think it safe to assume, as they do, that Alexander carried over with him to Asia *just half* of the Macedonian entire force.

[2] Arrian, iii. 11, 11; iii. 13, 1; iii. 18, 8. In the first of these passages, we have *ἴλαι βασιλικαὶ* in the plural (iii. 11, 12). It seems too that the different *ἴλαι* alternated with each other in the foremost position, or *ἡγεμονία*, for particular days (Arrian, i. 14, 9).

[3] Arrian, iii. 16, 19.

The select Macedonian Body-guards. The Royal Pages.

an Agêma or chosen cohort, which was called upon oftener than the rest to begin the fight. A still more select corps were, the Body-Guards; a small company of tried and confidential men, individually known to Alexander, always attached to his person, and acting as adjutants or as commanders for special service. These Body-Guards appear to have been chosen persons promoted out of the Royal Youths or Pages; an institution first established by Philip, and evincing the pains taken by him to bring the leading Macedonians into military organization as well as into dependence on his own person. The Royal Youths, sons of the chief persons throughout Macedonia, were taken by Philip into service, and kept in permanent residence around him for purposes of domestic attendance and companionship. They maintained perpetual guard of his palace, alternating among themselves the hours of daily and nightly watch; they received his horse from the grooms, assisted him to mount, and accompanied him if he went to the chase: they introduced persons who came to solicit interviews, and admitted his mistresses by night through a special door. They enjoyed the privilege of sitting down to dinner with him, as well as that of never being flogged except by his special order[1]. The precise number of the

[1] Arrian, iv. 13, 1. Ἐκ Φιλίππου ἦν ἤδη καθεστηκὸς, τῶν ἐν τέλει Μακεδόνων τοὺς παῖδας, ὅσοι ἐς ἡλικίαν ἐμειρακίσαντο, καταλέγεσθαι ἐς θεραπείαν τοῦ βασιλέως. Τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν ἄλλην δίαιταν τοῦ σώματος διακονεῖσθαι βασιλεῖ, καὶ κοιμώμενον φυλάσσειν, τούτοις ἐπετέτραπτο· καὶ ὅποτε ἐξέλαυνοι βασιλεὺς, τοὺς ἵππους παρὰ τῶν ἱππυκόμων δεχόμενοι ἐκεῖνοι προσῆγον, καὶ ἀνέβαλον οὗτοι βασιλέα τὸν Περσικὸν τρόπον, καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ θήρᾳ φιλοτιμίας βασιλεῖ κοινωνοὶ ἦσαν, &c.

Curtius, viii. 6, 1. "Mos erat principibus Macedonum adultos liberos

company we do not know; but it must have been not small, since fifty of these youths were brought out from Macedonia at once by Amyntas to join Alexander and to be added to the company at Babylon[1]. At the same time the mortality among them was probably considerable; since, in accompanying Alexander, they endured even more than the prodigious fatigues which he imposed upon himself[2]. The training in this corps was a preparation first for becoming Body-guards of Alexander,—next, for appointment to the great and important military commands. Accordingly, it had been the first stage of advancement to most of the Diadochi, or great officers of Alexander, who after his death carved kingdoms for themselves out of his conquests.

regibus tradere, ad munia haud multum servilibus ministeriis abhorrentia. Excubabant servatis noctium vicibus proximi foribus ejus ædis, in quâ rex acquiescebat. Per hos pellices introducebantur, alio aditu quam quem armati obsidebant. Iidem acceptos ab agasonibus equos, quum rex ascensurus esset, admovebant; comitabanturque et venantem, et in præliis, omnibus artibus studiorum liberalium exculti. Præcipuus honor habebatur, quod licebat sedentibus vesci cum rege. Castigandi eos verberibus nullius potestas præter ipsum erat. Hæc cohors velut seminarium ducum præfectorumque apud Macedonas fuit: hinc habuere posteri reges, quorum stirpibus post multas ætates Romani opes ademerunt." Compare Curtius, v. 6, 42; and Ælian, V. H. xiv. 49.

This information is interesting, as an illustration of Macedonian manners and customs, which are very little known to us. In the last hours of the Macedonian monarchy, after the defeat at Pydna (168 B.C.), the *pueri regii* followed the defeated king Perseus to the sanctuary at Samothrace, and never quitted him until the moment when he surrendered himself to the Romans (Livy, xlv. 5).

As an illustration of the scourging, applied as a punishment to these young Macedonians of rank, see the case of Dekamnichus, handed over by king Archelaus to Euripides, to be flogged (Aristotle, Polit. v. 8, 13).

[1] Curtius, v. 6, 42; Diodor. xvii. 65.

[2] We read this about the youthful Philippus, brother of Lysimachus (Curtius, viii. 2, 36).

Foreign auxiliaries —Grecian hoplites— Thessalian cavalry— Pæonians— Illyrians— Thracians, &c.

It was thus that the native Macedonian force was enlarged and diversified by Philip, including at his death—1. The phalanx, Foot-companions, or general mass of heavy infantry, drilled to the use of the long two-handed pike or sarissa—2. The Hypaspists, or lighter-armed corps of foot-guards—3. The Companions, or heavy cavalry, the ancient indigenous force consisting of the more opulent or substantial Macedonians—4. The lighter cavalry, lancers, or Sarissophori.—With these were joined foreign auxiliaries of great value. The Thessalians, whom Philip had partly subjugated and partly gained over, furnished him with a body of heavy cavalry not inferior to the native Macedonian. From various parts of Greece he derived hoplites, volunteers taken into his pay, armed with the full-sized shield and one-handed pike. From the warlike tribes of Thracians, Pæonians, Illyrians, &c., whom he had subdued around him, he levied contingents of light troops of various descriptions, peltasts, bowmen, darters, &c., all excellent in their way, and eminently serviceable to his combinations, in conjunction with the heavier masses. Lastly, Philip had completed his military arrangements by organising what may be called an effective siege-train for sieges as well as for battles; a stock of projectile and battering machines, superior to any thing at that time extant. We find this artillery used by Alexander in the very first year of his reign, in his campaign against the Illyrians[1]. Even in his most distant Indian marches, he either carried it with him, or had the means of constructing new engines

[1] Arrian, i. 6, 17.

for the occasion. There was no part of his military equipment more essential to his conquests. The victorious sieges of Alexander are among his most memorable exploits.

Magazines, war-office, and depôt, at Pella.

To all this large, multifarious, and systematised array of actual force, are to be added the civil establishments, the depôts, magazines of arms, provision for remounts, drill officers and adjutants, &c. indispensable for maintaining it in constant training and efficiency. At the time of Philip's accession, Pella was an unimportant place[1]; at his death, it was not only strong as a fortification and place of deposit for regal treasure, but also the permanent centre, war-office, and training quarters, of the greatest military force then known. The military registers as well as the traditions of Macedonian discipline were preserved there until the fall of the monarchy[2]. Philip had employed his life in organising this powerful instrument of dominion. His revenues, large as they were, both from mines and from tributary conquests, had been exhausted in the work, so that he had left at his decease a debt of 500 talents. But his son Alexander found the instrument ready made, with excellent officers, and trained veterans for the front ranks of his phalanx[3].

This scientific organization of military force, on

[1] Demosthenes, De Coronâ, p. 247.

[2] Livy, xlii. 51; xliv. 46, also the comparison in Strabo, xvi. p. 752, between the military establishments of Seleukus Nikator at Apameia in Syria, and those of Philip at Pella in Macedonia.

[3] Justin, xi. 6. About the debt of 500 talents left by Philip, see the words of Alexander, Arrian, vii. 9, 10. Diodorus affirms (xvi. 8) that Philip's annual return from the gold mines was 1000 talents; a total not much to be trusted.

Macedonian aptitudes—purely military—military pride stood to them in lieu of national sentiment.

a large scale and with all the varieties of arming and equipment made to cooperate for one end, is the great fact of Macedonian history. Nothing of the same kind and magnitude had ever before been seen. The Macedonians, like Epirots and Ætolians, had no other aptitude or marking quality except those of soldiership. Their rude and scattered tribes manifest no definite political institutions and little sentiment of national brotherhood; their union was mainly that of occasional fellowship in arms under the king as chief. Philip the son of Amyntas was the first to organise this military union into a system permanently and efficaciously operative, achieving by means of it conquests such as to create in the Macedonians a common pride of superiority in arms, which served as substitute for political institutions or nationality. Such pride was still farther exalted by the really superhuman career of Alexander. The Macedonian kingdom was nothing but a well-combined military machine, illustrating the irresistible superiority of the rudest men, trained in arms and conducted by an able general, not merely over undisciplined multitudes, but also over free, courageous, and disciplined, citizenship with highly gifted intelligence.

B.C. 334. Measures of Alexander previous to his departure for Asia. Antipater left as viceroy at Pella.

During the winter of 335–334 B.C., after the destruction of Thebes and the return of Alexander from Greece to Pella, his final preparations were made for the Asiatic expedition. The Macedonian army with the auxiliary contingents destined for this enterprise were brought together early in the spring. Antipater, one of the oldest and ablest officers of Philip, was appointed to act as viceroy of Macedonia

during the king's absence. A military force, stated at 12,000 infantry and 1500 cavalry[1], was left with him to keep down the cities of Greece, to resist aggressions from the Persian fleet, and to repress discontents at home. Such discontents were likely to be instigated by leading Macedonians or pretenders to the throne, especially as Alexander had no direct heir: and we are told that Antipater and Parmenio advised postponement of the expedition until the young king could leave behind him an heir of his own lineage[2]. Alexander overruled these representations; yet he did not disdain to lessen the perils at home by putting to death such men as he principally feared or mistrusted, especially the kinsmen of Philip's last wife Kleopatra[3]. Of the

[1] Diodor. xvii. 17.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 16.

[3] Justin, xi. 5. "Proficiscens ad Persicum bellum, omnes novercæ suæ cognatos, quos Philippus in excelsiorem dignitatis locum provehens imperiis præfecerat, interfecit. Sed nec suis, qui apti regno videbantur, pepercit; ne qua materia seditionis procul se agente in Macedoniâ remaneret." Compare also xii. 6, where the Pausanias mentioned as having been put to death by Alexander is *not* the assassin of Philip. Pausanias was a common Macedonian name (see Diodor. xvi. 93).

I see no reason for distrusting the general fact here asserted by Justin. We know from Arrian (who mentioned the fact incidentally in his work τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον, though he says nothing about it in his account of the expedition of Alexander—see Photius, Cod. 92. p. 220) that Alexander put to death, in the early period of his reign, his first cousin and brother-in-law Amyntas. Much less would he scruple to kill the friends or relatives of Kleopatra. Neither Alexander nor Antipater would account such proceeding anything else than a reasonable measure of prudential policy. By the Macedonian common law, when a man was found guilty of treason, all his relatives were condemned to die along with him (Curtius, vi. 11, 20).

Plutarch (De Fortunâ Alex. Magn. p. 342) has a general allusion to these precautionary executions ordered by Alexander. Fortune (he says) imposed upon Alexander δεινὴν πρὸς ἄνδρας ὁμοφύλους καὶ συγγενεῖς διὰ φόνου καὶ σιδήρου καὶ πυρὸς ἀνάγκην ἀμύνης, ἀτερπέστατον τέλος ἔχουσαν.

dependent tribes around, the most energetic chiefs accompanied his army into Asia, either by their own preference or at his requisition. After these precautions, the tranquillity of Macedonia was entrusted to the prudence and fidelity of Antipater, which were still farther ensured by the fact that three of his sons accompanied the king's army and person[1]. Though unpopular in his deportment[2], Antipater discharged the duties of his very responsible position with zeal and ability; notwithstanding the dangerous enmity of Olympias, against whom he sent many complaints to Alexander when in Asia, whilst she on her side wrote frequent but unavailing letters with a view to ruin him in the esteem of her son. After a long period of unabated confidence, Alexander began during the last years of his life to dislike and mistrust Antipater. He always treated Olympias with the greatest respect; trying however to restrain her from meddling with political affairs, and complaining sometimes of her imperious exigences and violence[3].

B.C. 334, April. The army intended for Asia, having been assembled at Pella, was conducted by Alexander himself

[1] Kassander commanded a corps of Thracians and Pæonians: Iollas and Philippus were attached to the king's person (Arrian, vii. 27, 2; Justin, xii. 14; Diodor. xvii. 17).

[2] Justin, xvi. 1, 14. "Antipatrum—amariorem semper ministrum regni, quam ipsos reges, fuisse," &c.

[3] Plutarch, Alexand. 25–39; Arrian, vii. 12, 12. He was wont to say, that his mother exacted from him a heavy house-rent for his domicile of ten months.

Kleopatra also (sister of Alexander and daughter of Olympias) exercised considerable influence in the government. Dionysius, despot of the Pontic Herakleia, maintained himself against opposition in his government, during Alexander's life, mainly by paying assiduous court to her (Memnon, Heracl. c. 4. ap. Photium, Cod. 224).

first to Amphipolis, where it crossed the Strymon; next along the road near the coast to the river Nestus and to the towns of Abdêra and Maroneia; then through Thrace across the rivers Hebrus and Melas; lastly, through the Thracian Chersonese to Sestos. Here it was met by his fleet, consisting of 160 triremes, with a number of trading vessels besides[1]; made up in large proportions from contingents furnished by Athens and Grecian cities[2]. The passage of the whole army, infantry, cavalry, and machines, on ships, across the strait from Sestos in Europe to Abydos in Asia,—was superintended by Parmenio, and accomplished without either difficulty or resistance. But Alexander himself, separating from the army at Sestos, went down to Elæus at the southern extremity of the Chersonese. Here stood the chapel and sacred precinct of the hero Protesilaus, who was slain by Hektor; having been the first Greek (according to the legend of the Trojan war) who touched the shore of Troy. Alexander, whose imagination was then full of Homeric reminiscences, offered sacrifice to the hero, praying that his own disembarkation might terminate more auspiciously.

March of Alexander to the Hellespont. Passage across to Asia.

He then sailed across in the admiral's trireme, steering with his own hand, to the landing place near Ilium called the Harbour of the Achæans. At mid-channel of the strait, he sacrificed a bull, with libations out of a golden goblet, to Poseidon and the Nereids. Himself too in full armour, he was the first (like Protesilaus) to tread the Asiatic shore;

Visit of Alexander to Ilium.

[1] Arrian, i. 11, 9.

[2] The Athenians furnished twenty ships of war, Diodor. xvii. 22.

but he found no enemy like Hektor to meet him. From hence, mounting the hill on which Ilium was placed, he sacrificed to the patron-goddess Athênê; and deposited in her temple his own panoply, taking in exchange some of the arms said to have been worn by the heroes in the Trojan war, which he caused to be carried by guards along with him in his subsequent battles. Among other real or supposed monuments of this interesting legend, the Ilians showed to him the residence of Priam with its altar of Zeus Herkeios, where that unhappy old king was alleged to have been slain by Neoptolemus. Numbering Neoptolemus among his ancestors, Alexander felt himself to be the object of Priam's yet unappeased wrath; and accordingly offered sacrifice to him at the same altar, for the purpose of expiation and reconciliation. On the tomb and monumental column of Achilles, father of Neoptolemus, he not only placed a decorative garland, but also went through the customary ceremony of anointing himself with oil and running naked round it: exclaiming how much he envied the lot of Achilles, who had been blest during life with a faithful friend, and after death, with a great poet to celebrate his exploits. Lastly, to commemorate his crossing, Alexander erected permanent altars, in honour of Zeus, Athênê, and Hêraklês; both on the point of Europe which his army had quitted, and on that of Asia where it had landed[1].

[1] Arrian, i. 11; Plutarch, Alexand. 15; Justin, xi. 5. The ceremony of running round the column of Achilles still subsisted in the time of Plutarch—ἀλειψάμενος λίπα καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἑταίρων συναναδραμὼν γυμνὸς, ὥσπερ ἔθος ἔστιν, &c. Philostratus, five centuries after Alexander, conveys a vivid picture of the numerous legendary and religious associa-

Analogy of Alexander to the Greek heroes.

The proceedings of Alexander, on the ever-memorable site of Ilium, are interesting as they reveal one side of his imposing character—the vein of legendary sympathy and religious sentiment wherein alone consisted his analogy with the Greeks. The young Macedonian prince had nothing of that sense of correlative right and obligation, which characterised the free Greeks of the city-community. But he was in many points a reproduction of the heroic Greeks[1], his warlike ancestors in legend, Achilles and Neoptolemus, and others of that Æakid race, unparalleled in the attributes of force—a man of violent impulse in all directions, sometimes generous, often vindictive—ardent in his individual affec-

tions connected with the plain of Troy and with the tomb of Protesilaus at Elæus, and of the many rites and ceremonies performed there even in his time (Philostrat. Heroica, xix. 14, 15. p. 742, ed. Olearius —δρόμοις δ' ἐῤῥυθμισμένοις συνηλάλαζον, ἀνακαλοῦντες τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, &c., and the pages preceding and following).

Dikæarchus (Fragm. 19, ed. Didot. ap. Athenæum, xiii. p. 603) had treated in a special work about the sacrifices offered to Athênê at Ilium (Περὶ τῆς ἐν Ἰλίῳ θυσίας) by Alexander, and by many others before him; by Xerxes (Herodot. vii. 43), who offered up 1000 oxen—by Mindarus (Xenoph. Hellen. i. 1, 4), &c. In describing the proceedings of Alexander at Ilium, Dikæarchus appears to have dwelt much on the warm sympathy which that prince exhibited for the affection between Achilles and Patroklus: which sympathy Dikæarchus illustrated by characterising Alexander as φιλόπαις ἐκμανῶς, and by recounting his public admiration for the eunuch Bagôas: compare Curtius, x. i. 25—about Bagôas.

[1] Plutarch, Fort. Al. M. ii. p. 334. Βριθὺς ὁπλιτοπάλας, δαΐος ἀντιπάλοις—ταύτην ἔχων τέχνην προγονικὴν ἀπ' Αἰακιδῶν, &c.

Ἄλκην μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκεν Ὀλύμπιος Αἰακίδῃσι,
Νοῦν δ' Ἀμυθαονίδαις, πλοῦτον δ' ἔπορ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν.
(Hesiod. Fragment. 223, ed. Marktscheffel.)

Like Achilles, Alexander was distinguished for swiftness of foot (Plutarch, Fort. Al. M. i. p. 331).

tions both of love and hatred, but devoured especially by an inextinguishable pugnacity, appetite for conquest, and thirst for establishing at all cost his superiority of force over others—"Jura negat sibi nata, nihil non arrogat armis"—taking pride, not simply in victorious generalship and direction of the arms of soldiers, but also in the personal forwardness of an Homeric chief, the foremost to encounter both danger and hardship. To dispositions resembling those of Achilles, Alexander indeed added one attribute of a far higher order. As a general, he surpassed his age in provident and even long-sighted combinations. With all his exuberant courage and sanguine temper, nothing was ever omitted in the way of systematic military precaution. Thus much he borrowed, though with many improvements of his own, from Grecian intelligence as applied to soldiership. But the character and dispositions, which he took with him to Asia, had the features, both striking and repulsive, of Achilles, rather than those of Agesilaus or Epaminondas.

Review and total of the Macedonian army in Asia.

The army, when reviewed on the Asiatic shore after its crossing, presented a total of 30,000 infantry, and 4500 cavalry, thus distributed:—

INFANTRY.

Macedonian phalanx and hypaspists	12,000
Allies	7,000
Mercenaries	5,000
Under the command of Parmenio	24,000
Odryssians, Triballi (both Thracians), and Illyrians	5,000
Agriânes and archers	1,000
Total infantry	30,000

CAVALRY.

Macedonian heavy—under Philotas son of Parmenio	1500
Thessalian (also heavy)—under Kallas	1500
Miscellaneous Grecian—under Erigyius	600
Thracian and Pæonian (light)—under Kassander	900
Total Cavalry	4500

Such seems the most trustworthy enumeration of Alexander's first invading army. There were however other accounts, the highest of which stated as much as 43,000 infantry with 4000 cavalry[1]. Besides these troops, also, there must have been an effective train of projectile machines and engines, for battles and sieges, which we shall soon find in operation. As to money, the military chest of Alexander, exhausted in part by profuse donatives to his Macedonian officers[2], was as poorly furnished as that of Napoleon Buonaparte on first entering Italy for his brilliant campaign of 1796. According to Aristobulus, he had with him only seventy talents;

[1] Diodor. xvii. 17. Plutarch (Alexand. 15) says that the highest numbers which he had read of, were,—43,000 infantry with 5000 cavalry: the lowest numbers, 30,000 infantry with 4000 cavalry (assuming the correction of Sintenis, τετρακισχιλίους in place of πεντακισχιλίους, to be well founded, as it probably is—compare Plutarch, Fort. Alex. M. i. p. 327).

According to Plutarch (Fort. Al. M. p. 327), both Ptolemy and Aristobulus stated the number of infantry to be 30,000; but Ptolemy gave the cavalry as 5000, Aristobulus, as only 4000. Nevertheless Arrian—who professes to follow mainly Ptolemy and Aristobulus, whenever they agree—states the number of infantry as "not much more than 30,000; the cavalry as more than 5000" (Exp. Al. i. 11, 4). Anaximenes alleged 43,000 infantry, with 5500 cavalry. Kallisthenes (ap. Polybium. xii. 19) stated 40,000 infantry, with 4500 cavalry. Justin (xi. 6) gives 32,000 infantry, with 4500 cavalry.

My statement in the text follows Diodorus, who stands distinguished, by recounting not merely the total, but the component items besides. In regard to the total of infantry, he agrees with Ptolemy and Aristobulus: as to cavalry, his statement is a mean between the two.

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 15.

according to another authority, no more than the means of maintaining his army for thirty days. Nor had he even been able to bring together his auxiliaries, or complete the outfit of his army, without incurring a debt of 800 talents, in addition to that of 500 talents contracted by his father Philip[1]. Though Plutarch[2] wonders at the smallness of the force with which Alexander contemplated the execution of such great projects, yet the fact is, that in infantry he was far above any force which the Persians had to oppose him[3]; not to speak of comparative discipline and organization, surpassing even that of the Grecian mercenaries, who formed the only good infantry in the Persian service; while his cavalry, though inferior as to number, was superior in quality and in the shock of close combat.

Chief Macedonian officers.

Most of the officers exercising important command in Alexander's army were native Macedonians. His intimate personal friend Hephæstion, as well as his body-guards Leonnatus and Lysimachus, were natives of Pella: Ptolemy the son of Lagus, and Pithon, were Eordians from Upper Macedonia; Kraterus and Perdikkas, from the district of Upper Macedonia called Orestis[4]; Antipater with his son Kassander, Kleitus son of Drôpides, Parmenio with

[1] Arrian, vii. 9, 10—the speech which he puts in the mouth of Alexander himself—and Curtius, x. 2, 24.

Onesikritus stated that Alexander owed at this time a debt of 200 talents (Plutarch, Alex. 15).

[2] Plutarch, Fort. Alex. M. i. p. 327; Justin, xi. 6.

[3] Arrian, i. 13, 4.

[4] Arrian, vi. 28, 6; Arrian, Indica, 18; Justin, xv. 3-4. Porphyry (Fragm. ap. Syncellum, Frag. Histor. Græc. vol. iii. p. 695-698) speaks of Lysimachus as a Thessalian from Kranon; but this must be a mistake: compare Justin, xv. 3.

his two sons Philôtas and Nikanor, Seleukus, Kœnus, Amyntas, Philippus (these two last names were borne by more than one person), Antigonus, Neoptolemus[1], Meleager, Peukestes, &c., all these seem to have been native Macedonians. All or most of them had been trained to war under Philip, in whose service Parmenio and Antipater, especially, had occupied a high rank.

Greeks in Alexander's service—Eumenes of Kardia.

Of the many Greeks in Alexander's service, we hear of few in important station. Medius, a Thessalian from Larissa, was among his familiar companions; but the ablest and most distinguished of all was Eumenes, a native of Kardia in the Thracian Chersonese. Eumenes, combining an excellent Grecian education with bodily activity and enterprise, had attracted when a young man the notice of Philip and had been appointed as his secretary. After discharging these duties for seven years until the death of Philip, he was continued by Alexander in the post of chief secretary during the whole of that king's life[2]. He conducted most of Alexander's correspondence, and the daily record of his proceedings, which was kept under the name of the Royal Ephemerides. But though his special duties were thus of a civil character, he was not less eminent as an officer in the field. Occasionally entrusted with high military command, he received from Alexander signal recompenses and tokens of esteem. In spite of these great qualities—or perhaps in consequence of them—he was the object of marked jealousy and

[1] Neoptolemus belonged, like Alexander himself, to the Æakid gens (Arrian, ii. 27, 9).

[2] Plutarch, Eumenes, c. 1; Cornelius Nepos, Eumen. c. 1.

dislike[1] on the part of the Macedonians,—from Hephæstion the friend, and Neoptolemus the chief armour-bearer, of Alexander, down to the principal soldiers of the phalanx. Neoptolemus despised Eumenes as an unwarlike penman. The contemptuous pride with which Macedonians had now come to look down on Greeks, is a notable characteristic of the victorious army of Alexander, as well as a new feature in history; retorting the ancient Hellenic sentiment in which Demosthenes, a few years before, had indulged towards the Macedonians[2].

Persian forces—Mentor and Memnon the Rhodians.

Though Alexander had been allowed to land in Asia unopposed, an army was already assembled under the Persian satraps within a few days' march of Abydos. Since the reconquest of Egypt and Phenicia, about eight or nine years before, by the Persian king Ochus, the power of that empire had been restored to a point equal to any anterior epoch since the repulse of Xerxes from Greece. The Persian successes in Egypt had been achieved mainly by the arms of Greek mercenaries, under the conduct and through the craft of the Rhodian general Mentor; who, being seconded by the preponderant influence of the eunuch Bagôas, confidential minister of Ochus, obtained not only ample presents, but also the appointment of military commander on the

[1] Arrian, vii. 13, 1; Plutarch, Eum. 2, 3, 8, 10.

[2] Demosth. Philipp. iii. p. 119, respecting Philip—*οὐ μόνον οὐχ Ἕλληνος ὄντος, οὐδὲ προσήκοντος οὐδὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βαρβάρου ἐντεῦθεν ὅθεν καλὸν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ' ὁλέθρου Μακεδόνος, ὅθεν οὐδ' ἀνδράποδον σπουδαῖον οὐδὲν ἦν πρότερον πρίασθαι.*

Compare this with the exclamations of the Macedonian soldiers (called Argyraspides) against their distinguished chief Eumenes, calling him *Χερρονησίτης ὄλεθρος* (Plutarch, Eumenes, 18).

Hellespont and the Asiatic seaboard[1]. He procured the recall of his brother Memnon, who with his brother-in-law Artabazus had been obliged to leave Asia from unsuccessful revolt against the Persians, and had found shelter with Philip[2]. He farther subdued, by force or by fraud, various Greek and Asiatic chieftains on the Asiatic coast; among them, the distinguished Hermeias, friend of Aristotle, and master of the strong post of Atarneus[3]. These successes of Mentor seem to have occurred about 343 B.C. He, and his brother Memnon after him, upheld vigorously the authority of the Persian king in the regions near the Hellespont. It was probably by them that troops were sent across the strait both to rescue the besieged town of Perinthus from Philip, and to act against that prince in other parts of Thrace[4]; that an Asiatic chief, who was intriguing to facilitate Philip's intended invasion of Asia, was seized and sent prisoner to the Persian court; and that envoys from Athens, soliciting aid against Philip, were forwarded to the same place[5].

Ochus, though successful in regaining the full extent of Persian dominion, was a sanguinary tyrant,

[1] See, in reference to these incidents, my last preceding volume, Vol. XI. Ch. xc. p. 610 *seq.*

[2] Diodor. xvi. 52; Curtius, vi. 4, 25; vi. 5, 2. Curtius mentions also Manapis, another Persian exile, who had fled from Ochus to Philip.

[3] Diodor. xvi. 52. About the strength of the fortress of Atarneus, see Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 2, 11; Diodor. xiii. 65. It had been held in defiance of the Persians, even before the time of Hermeias—Isokrates. Compare also Isokrates, Or. iv. (Panegyr.) s. 167.

[4] Letter of Alexander, addressed to Darius after the battle of Issus, apud Arrian. ii. 14, 7. Other troops sent by the Persians into Thrace (besides those despatched to the relief of Perinthus), are here alluded to.

[5] Demosthenes, Philippic. iv. p. 139, 140; Epistola Philippi apud Demosthen. p. 160.

29999

Succession of the Persian crown —Ochus— Darius Codomannus.

who shed by wholesale the blood of his family and courtiers. About the year 338 B.C., he died poisoned by the eunuch Bagôas, who placed upon the throne Arsês, one of the king's sons, killing all the rest. After two years, however, Bagôas conceived mistrust of Arses, and put him to death also, together with all his children; thus leaving no direct descendant of the regal family alive. He then exalted to the throne one of his friends named Darius Codomannus (descended from one of the brothers of Artaxerxes Mnemon), who had acquired glory, in a recent war against the Kadusians, by killing in single combat a formidable champion of the enemy's army. Presently, however, Bagôas attempted to poison Darius also; but the latter, detecting the snare, forced him to drink the deadly draught himself[1]. In spite of such murders and change in the line of succession, which Alexander afterwards reproached to Darius[2]—the authority of Darius seems to have been recognised, without any material opposition, throughout all the Persian empire.

Preparations of Darius for defence:

Succeeding to the throne in the early part of B.C. 336, when Philip was organising the projected invasion of Persia, and when the first Macedonian division under Parmenio and Attalus was already making war in Asia—Darius prepared measures of defence at home, and tried to encourage anti-Macedonian movements in Greece[3]. On the assassination of Philip by Pausanias, the Persian king publicly proclaimed himself (probably untruly) as having instigated the deed, and alluded in con-

[1] Diodor. xvii. 5; Justin, x. 3; Curtius, x. 5, 22.
[2] Arrian, ii. 14, 10.
[3] Diodor. xvii. 7.

temptuous terms to the youthful Alexander[1]. Conceiving the danger from Macedonia to be past, he imprudently slackened his efforts and withheld his supplies during the first months of Alexander's reign, when the latter might have been seriously embarrassed in Greece and in Europe by the effective employment of Persian ships and money. But the recent successes of Alexander in Thrace, Illyria, and Bœotia, satisfied Darius that the danger was not past, so that he resumed his preparations for defence. The Phenician fleet was ordered to be equipped: the satraps in Phrygia and Lydia got together a considerable force, consisting in part of Grecian mercenaries; while Memnon, on the seaboard, was furnished with the means of taking 5000 of these mercenaries under his separate command[2].

Operations of Memnon before Alexander's arrival.

We cannot trace with any exactness the course of these events, during the nineteen months between Alexander's accession and his landing in Asia (August 336 B.C. to March or April 334 B.C.). We learn generally that Memnon was active and even aggressive on the north-eastern coast of the Ægean. Marching northward from his own territory (the region of Assus or Atarneus skirting the Gulf of Adramyttium[3]) across the range of Mount Ida, he came suddenly upon the town of Kyzikus on the Propontis. He failed, however, though only by a little, in his attempt to surprise it, and was forced to content himself with a rich booty from the district around[4]. The Macedonian generals

[1] Arrian, ii. 14, 11.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 7.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 7: compare Arrian, i. 17, 9. ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν Μέμνονος ἔπεμψεν—which doubtless means this region, conquered by Mentor from Hermeias of Atarneus.

[4] Diodor. xvii. 7; Polyænus, v. 34, 5.

Parmenio and Kallas had crossed into Asia with bodies of troops. Parmenio, acting in Æolis, took Grynium, but was compelled by Memnon to raise the siege of Pitanê; while Kallas, in the Troad, was attacked, defeated, and compelled to retire to Rhœteium[1].

Superiority of the Persians at sea: their imprudence in letting Alexander cross the Hellespont unopposed.

We thus see that during the season preceding the landing of Alexander, the Persians were in considerable force, and Memnon both active and successful even against the Macedonian generals, on the region north-east of the Ægean. This may help to explain that fatal imprudence, whereby the Persians permitted Alexander to carry over without opposition his grand army into Asia, in the spring of 334 B.C. They possessed ample means of guarding the Hellespont, had they chosen to bring up their fleet, which, comprising as it did the force of the Phenician towns, was decidedly superior to any naval armament at the disposal of Alexander. The Persian fleet actually came into the Ægean a few weeks afterwards. Now Alexander's designs, preparations, and even intended time of march, must have been well known not merely to Memnon, but to the Persian satraps in Asia Minor, who had got together troops to oppose him. These satraps unfortunately supposed themselves to be a match for him in the field, disregarding the pronounced opinion of Memnon to the contrary, and even overruling his prudent advice by mistrustful and calumnious imputations.

At the time of Alexander's landing, a powerful Persian force was already assembled near Zeleia in

[1] Diodor. xvii. 7. We read also of military operations near Magnesia, between Parmenio and Memnon (Polyænus, v. 34, 4).

the Hellespontine Phrygia, under command of Arsites the Phrygian satrap, supported by several other leading Persians—Spithridates (satrap of Lydia and Ionia), Pharnakes, Atizyes, Mithridates, Rhomithres, Niphates, Petines, &c. Forty of these men were of high rank (denominated kinsmen of Darius), and distinguished for personal valour. The greater number of the army consisted of cavalry, including Medes, Baktrians, Hyrkanians, Kappadokians, Paphlagonians, &c.[1] In cavalry they greatly outnumbered Alexander; but their infantry was much inferior in number[2], composed however, in large proportion, of Grecian mercenaries. The Persian total is given by Arrian as 20,000 cavalry, and nearly 20,000 mercenary foot; by Diodorus as 10,000 cavalry, and 100,000 infantry; by Justin even at 600,000. The numbers of Arrian are the more credible; in those of Diodorus, the total of infantry is certainly much above the truth—that of cavalry probably below it.

Persian force assembled in Phrygia, under Arsites and others.

Memnon, who was present with his sons and with his own division, earnestly dissuaded the Persian leaders from hazarding a battle. Reminding them that the Macedonians were not only much superior in infantry, but also encouraged by the leadership of Alexander—he enforced the necessity of employing their numerous cavalry to destroy the forage and provisions, and if necessary, even towns themselves—in order to render any considerable advance of the invading force impracticable. While keeping strictly on the defen-

Advice of Memnon, to avoid fighting on land, and to employ the fleet for aggressive warfare in Macedonia and Greece.

[1] Diodor. xvii. 18, 19; Arrian, i. 12, 14; i. 16, 5.
[2] Arrian, i. 12, 16; i. 13, 4.

sive in Asia, he recommended that aggressive war should be carried into Macedonia; that the fleet should be brought up, a powerful land-force put aboard, and strenuous efforts made, not only to attack the vulnerable points of Alexander at home, but also to encourage active hostility against him from the Greeks and other neighbours[1].

Had this plan been energetically executed by Persian arms and money, we can hardly doubt that Antipater in Macedonia would speedily have found himself pressed by serious dangers and embarrassments, and that Alexander would have been forced to come back and protect his own dominions; perhaps prevented by the Persian fleet from bringing back his whole army. At any rate, his schemes of Asiatic invasion must for the time have been suspended. But he was rescued from this dilemma by the ignorance, pride, and pecuniary interests of

Arsites rejects Memnon's advice, and determines to fight.

[1] Compare the policy recommended by Memnon, as set forth in Arrian (i. 12, 16), and in Diodorus (xvii. 18). The superiority of Diodorus is here incontestable. He proclaims distinctly both the defensive and the offensive side of Memnon's policy; which, when taken together, form a scheme of operations no less effective than prudent. But Arrian omits all notice of the offensive policy, and mentions only the defensive—the retreat and destruction of the country; which, if adopted alone, could hardly have been reckoned upon for success, in starving out Alexander, and might reasonably be called in question by the Persian generals. Moreover, we should form but a poor idea of Memnon's ability, if in this emergency he neglected to avail himself of the irresistible Persian fleet.

I notice the rather this point of superiority of Diodorus, because recent critics have manifested a tendency to place too exclusive a confidence in Arrian, and to discredit almost all allegations respecting Alexander except such as Arrian either certifies or countenances. Arrian is a very valuable historian; he has the merit of giving us plain narrative without rhetoric, which contrasts favourably both with Diodorus and with Curtius; but he must not be set up as the only trustworthy witness.

the Persian leaders. Unable to appreciate Alexander's military superiority, and conscious at the same time of their own personal bravery, they repudiated the proposition of retreat as dishonourable, insinuating that Memnon desired to prolong the war in order to exalt his own importance in the eyes of Darius. This sentiment of military dignity was farther strengthened by the fact, that the Persian military leaders, deriving all their revenues from the land, would have been impoverished by destroying the landed produce. Arsites, in whose territory the army stood, and upon whom the scheme would first take effect, haughtily announced that he would not permit a single house in it to be burnt[1]. Occupying the same satrapy as Pharnabazus had possessed sixty years before, he felt that he would be reduced to the same straits as Pharnabazus under the pressure of Agesilaus—"of not being able to procure a dinner in his own country[2]." The proposition of Memnon was rejected, and it was resolved to await the arrival of Alexander on the banks of the river Granikus.

The Persians take post on the river Granikus.

This unimportant stream, commemorated in the Iliad, and immortalised by its association with the name of Alexander, takes its rise from one of the heights of Mount Ida near Skêpsis[3], and flows northward into the Propontis, which it reaches at a point somewhat east of the Greek town of Parium. It is of no great depth: near the point where the

[1] Arrian, i. 12, 18. [2] Xenophon, Hellenic. iv. 1, 33.

[3] Strabo, xiii. p. 602. The rivers Skamander, Æsepus, and Granikus, all rise from the same height, called Kotylus. This comes from Demetrius, a native of Skepsis.

Persians encamped, it seems to have been fordable in many places; but its right bank was somewhat high and steep, thus offering obstruction to an enemy's attack. The Persians, marching forward from Zeleia, took up a position near the eastern side of the Granikus, where the last declivities of Mount Ida descend into the plain of Adrasteia, a Greek city situated between Priapus and Parium[1].

Alexander reaches the Granikus, and resolves to force the passage at once, in spite of the dissuasion of Parmenio.

Meanwhile Alexander marched onward towards this position, from Arisbê (where he had reviewed his army)—on the first day to Perkôtê, on the second to the river Praktius, on the third to Hermôtus; receiving on his way the spontaneous surrender of the town of Priapus. Aware that the enemy was not far distant, he threw out in advance a body of scouts under Amyntas, consisting of four squadrons of light cavalry and one of the heavy Macedonian (Companion) cavalry. From Hermôtus (the fourth day from Arisbê) he marched direct towards the Granikus, in careful order, with his main phalanx in double files, his cavalry on each wing, and the baggage in the rear. On approaching the river, he made his dispositions for immediate attack, though Parmenio advised waiting until the next morning. Knowing well, like Memnon on the other side, that the chances of a pitched battle were all against the Persians, he resolved to leave them no opportunity of decamping during the night.

In Alexander's array, the phalanx or heavy in-

[1] Diodor. xvii. 18, 19. Οἱ *βάρβαροι, τὴν ὑπώρειαν κατειλημμένοι*, &c. "prima congressio in campis Adrastiis fuit." Justin, xi. 6: compare Strabo, xiii. p. 587, 588.

fantry formed the central body. The six Taxeis or divisions, of which it consisted, were commanded (reckoning from right to left) by Perdikkas, Kœnus, Amyntas son of Andromenes, Philippus, Meleager, and Kraterus[1]. Immediately on the right of the phalanx, were the hypaspistæ, or light infantry, under Nikanor son of Parmenio—then the light horse or lancers, the Pæonians, and the Apolloniate squadron of Companion-cavalry commanded by the Ilarch Sokrates, all under Amyntas son of Arrhibæus—lastly the full body of Companion-cavalry, the bowmen, and the Agrianian darters, all under Philôtas (son of Parmenio), whose division formed the extreme right[2]. The left flank of the phalanx was in like manner protected by three distinct divisions of cavalry or lighter troops—first, by the Thracians, under Agathon—next, by the cavalry of the allies, under Philippus son of Menelaus—lastly, by the Thessalian cavalry, under Kallas, whose division formed the extreme left. Alexander himself took the command of the right, giving that of the left to Parmenio; by right and left are meant,

Disposition of the two armies.

[1] Arrian, i. 14, 3. The text of Arrian is not clear., The name of Kraterus occurs twice. Various explanations are proposed. The words ἔστε ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον τῆς ξυμπάσης τάξεως seem to prove that there were three τάξεις of the phalanx (Kraterus, Meleager, and Philippus) included in the left half of the army—and three others (Perdikkas, Kœnus, and Amyntas) in the right half; while the words ἐπὶ δὲ, ἡ Κρατέρου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου appear wrongly inserted. There is no good reason for admitting *two* distinguished officers, each named Kraterus. The name of Philippus and his τάξις is repeated twice; once in counting from the right of the τάξεις,—once again in counting from the left.

[2] Plutarch states that Alexander struck into the river with thirteen squadrons (ἴλαι) of cavalry. Whether this total includes all then present in the field, or only the Companion-cavalry—we cannot determine (Plutarch, Alex. 16).

the two halves of the army, each of them including three Taxeis or divisions of the phalanx with the cavalry on its flank—for there was no recognized centre under a distinct command. On the other side of the Granikus, the Persian cavalry lined the bank. The Medes and Baktrians were on their right, under Rheomithres—the Paphlagonians and Hyrkanians in the centre, under Arsites and Spithridates—on the left were Memnon and Arsamenes, with their divisions[1]. The Persian infantry, both Asiatic and Grecian, were kept back in reserve; the cavalry alone being relied upon to dispute the passage of the river.

Battle of the Granikus.

In this array, both parties remained for some time, watching each other in anxious silence[2]. There being no firing or smoke, as with modern armies, all the details on each side were clearly visible to the other; so that the Persians easily recognized Alexander himself on the Macedonian right from the splendour of his armour and military costume, as well as from the respectful demeanour of those around him. Their principal leaders accordingly thronged to their own left, which they reinforced with the main strength of their cavalry, in order to oppose him personally. Presently he addressed a few words of encouragement to the troops, and gave the order for advance. He directed the first attack to be made by the squadron of Companion-cavalry whose turn it was on that

[1] Diodor. xvii. 19.

[2] Arrian, i. 14, 8. *Χρόνον μὲν δὴ ἀμφότερα τὰ στρατεύματα, ἐπ' ἀκροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἑφεστῶτες, ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ μέλλον ὀκνεῖν ἡσυχίαν ἦγον· καὶ σιγὴ ἦν πολλὴ ἐφ' ἑκατέρων.*

day to take the lead—(the squadron of Apollonia, of which Sokrates was captain—commanded on this day by Ptolemæus son of Philippus) supported by the light horse or Lancers, the Pæonian darters (infantry), and one division of regularly armed infantry, seemingly hypaspistæ[1]. He then himself entered the river, at the head of the right half of the army, cavalry and infantry, which advanced under sound of trumpets and with the usual war-shouts. As the occasional depths of water prevented a straightforward march with one uniform line, the Macedonians slanted their course suitably to the fordable spaces; keeping their front extended so as to approach the opposite bank as much as possible in line, and not in separate columns with flanks exposed to the Persian cavalry[2]. Not merely the right under Alexander, but also the left under Parmenio, advanced and crossed in the same movement and under the like precautions.

The foremost detachment under Ptolemy and Amyntas, on reaching the opposite bank, encountered a strenuous resistance, concentrated as it was

[1] Arrian, i. 14, 9. *τοὺς προδρόμους ἱππέας* mean the same cavalry as those who are called (in i. 14, 2) *σαρισσοφόρους ἱππέας*, under Amyntas son of Arrhibæus.

[2] Arrian, i. 14, 10. Αὐτὸς δὲ (Alexander) *ἄγων τὸ δέξιον κέρας..... ἐμβαίνει ἐς τὸν πόρον, λοξὴν ἀεὶ παρατείνων τὴν τάξιν ἣ παρεῖλκε τὸ ῥεῦμα, ἵνα δὴ μὴ ἐκβαίνοντι αὐτῷ οἱ Πέρσαι κατὰ κέρας προσπίπτοιεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς, ὡς ἀνυστὸν, τῇ φάλαγγι προσμίξῃ αὐτοῖς.*

Apparently, this passage *λοξὴν ἀεὶ παρατείνων τὴν τάξιν, ἣ παρεῖλκε τὸ ῥεῦμα* is to be interpreted by the phrase which follows, describing the purpose to be accomplished.

I cannot think that the words imply a movement *in échellon*, as Rüstow and Köchly contend (Geschichte des Griechischen Kriegswesens, p. 271)—nor a crossing of the river *against* the stream, to break the force of the current, as is the opinion of others.

here upon one point. They found Memnon and his sons with the best of the Persian cavalry immediately in their front; some on the summit of the bank, from whence they hurled down their javelins —others down at the water's-edge, so as to come to closer quarters. The Macedonians tried every effort to make good their landing, and push their way by main force through the Persian horse, but in vain. Having both lower ground and insecure footing, they could make no impression, but were thrust back with some loss, and retired upon the main body which Alexander was now bringing across. On his approaching the shore, the same struggle was renewed around his person with increased fervour on both sides. He was himself among the foremost, and all near him were animated by his example. The horsemen on both sides became jammed together, and the contest was one of physical force and pressure by man and horse; but the Macedonians had a great advantage in being accustomed to the use of the strong close-fighting pike, while the Persian weapon was the missile javelin. At length the resistance was surmounted, and Alexander with those around him, gradually thrusting back the defenders, made good their way up the high bank to the level ground. At other points the resistance was not equally vigorous. The left and centre of the Macedonians, crossing at the same time on all practicable spaces along the whole line, overpowered the Persians stationed on the slope, and got up to the level ground with comparative facility[1]. Indeed no cavalry could

[1] Arrian, i. 15, 5. Καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν (Alexander himself) ξυνειστήκει

possibly stand on the bank to offer opposition to the phalanx with its array of long pikes, wherever this could reach the ascent in any continuous front. The easy crossing of the Macedonians at other points helped to constrain those Persians, who were contending with Alexander himself on the slope, to recede to the level ground above.

Cavalry-battle. Personal danger of Alexander. His life is saved by Kleitus.

Here again, as at the water's edge, Alexander was foremost in personal conflict. His pike having been broken, he turned to a soldier near him—Aretis, one of the horseguards who generally aided him in mounting his horse—and asked for another. But this man, having broken his pike also, showed the fragment to Alexander, requesting him to ask some one else; upon which the Corinthian Demaratus, one of the Companion-cavalry close at hand, gave him his weapon instead. Thus armed anew, Alexander spurred his horse forward against Mithridates (son-in-law of Darius), who was bringing up a column of cavalry to attack him, but was himself considerably in advance of it. Alexander thrust his pike into the face of Mithridates, and laid him prostrate on the ground: he then turned to another of the Persian leaders, Rhœsakes, who

μάχη καρτερὰ, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἄλλαι ἐπ' ἄλλαις τῶν τάξεων τοῖς Μακεδόσι διέβαινον οὐ χαλεπῶς ἤδη.

These words deserve attention, because they show how incomplete Arrian's description of the battle had before been. Dwelling almost exclusively upon the personal presence and achievements of Alexander, he had said little even about the right half of the army, and nothing at all about the left half of it under Parmenio. We discover from these words that *all* the τάξεις of the phalanx (not only the three in Alexander's half, but also the three in Parmenio's half) passed the river nearly at the same time, and for the most part, with little or no resistance.

struck him a blow on the head with his scimitar, knocked off a portion of his helmet, but did not penetrate beyond. Alexander avenged this blow by thrusting Rhœsakes through the body with his pike[1]. Meanwhile a third Persian leader, Spithridates, was actually close behind Alexander, with hand and scimitar uplifted to cut him down. At this critical moment, Kleitus son of Dropides—one of the ancient officers of Philip, high in the Macedonian service—struck with full force at the uplifted arm of Spithridates and severed it from the body, thus preserving Alexander's life. Other leading Persians, kinsmen of Spithridates, rushed desperately on Alexander, who received many blows on his armour, and was in much danger. But the efforts of his companions near were redoubled, both to defend his person and to second his adventurous daring. It was on that point that the Persian cavalry was first broken. On the left of the Macedonian line, the Thessalian cavalry also fought with vigour and success[2]; and the light-armed foot, intermingled with Alexander's cavalry generally, did great damage to the enemy. The rout of the Persian cavalry, once begun, speedily became general. They fled in all directions, pursued by the Macedonians.

Complete victory of Alexander. Destruction of the Grecian infantry on the side of the Persians.

But Alexander and his officers soon checked this ardour of pursuit, calling back their cavalry to complete his victory. The Persian infantry, Asiatics as well as Greeks, had remained without movement or orders, looking on the cavalry battle which

[1] Arrian, i. 15, 6-12; Diodor. xvi. 20; Plutarch, Alex. 16. These authors differ in the details. I follow Arrian.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 21.

had just disastrously terminated. To them Alexander immediately turned his attention[1]. He brought up his phalanx and hypaspistæ to attack them in front, while his cavalry assailed on all sides their unprotected flanks and rear; he himself charged with the cavalry, and had a horse killed under him. His infantry alone was more numerous than they, so that against such odds the result could hardly be doubtful. The greater part of these mercenaries, after a valiant resistance, were cut to pieces on the field. We are told that none escaped, except 2000 made prisoners, and some who remained concealed in the field among the dead bodies[2].

Loss of the Persians—numbers of their leading men slain.

In this complete and signal defeat, the loss of the Persian cavalry was not very serious in mere number—for only 1000 of them were slain. But the slaughter of the leading Persians, who had exposed themselves with extreme bravery in the personal conflict against Alexander, was terrible. There were slain not only Mithridates, Rhœsakes, and Spithridates, whose names have been already mentioned,—but also Pharnakes, brother-in-law of Darius, Mithrobarzanes satrap of Kappadokia, Atizyes, Niphates, Petines, and others; all Persians of rank and consequence. Arsites, the satrap of Phrygia, whose rashness had mainly caused the rejection of Memnon's advice, escaped from the field, but died shortly afterwards by his own hand, from anguish

[1] Arrian, i. 16, 1. Plutarch says that the infantry, on seeing the cavalry routed, demanded to capitulate on terms with Alexander; but this seems hardly probable.

[2] Arrian, i. 16, 4; Diodor. xvii. 21. Diodorus says that on the part of the Persians more than 10,000 foot were killed, with 2000 cavalry; and that more than 20,000 men were made prisoners.

and humiliation[1]. The Persian or Perso-Grecian infantry, though probably more of them individually escaped than is implied in Arrian's account, was as a body irretrievably ruined. No force was either left in the field, or could be afterwards reassembled in Asia Minor.

Small loss of the Macedonians.

The loss on the side of Alexander is said to have been very small. Twenty-five of the Companion-cavalry, belonging to the division under Ptolemy and Amyntas, were slain in the first unsuccessful attempt to pass the river. Of the other cavalry, sixty in all were slain; of the infantry, thirty. This is given to us as the entire loss on the side of Alexander[2]. It is only the number of killed; that of the wounded is not stated; but assuming it to be ten times the number of killed, the total of both together will be 1265[3]. If this be correct, the resistance of the Persian cavalry, except near that point where Alexander himself and the Persian chiefs came into conflict, cannot have been either serious or long protracted. But when we add farther the contest with the infantry, the smallness of the total assigned for Macedonian killed and wounded will appear still more surprising. The total of the Persian infantry is stated at nearly 20,000, most part of them Greek mercenaries. Of these only 2000 were made prisoners; nearly all the rest (according to Arrian) were slain. Now the Greek mercenaries were well

[1] Arrian, i. 16, 5, 6.

[2] Arrian, i. 16, 7, 8.

[3] Arrian, in describing another battle, considers that the proportion of twelve to one, between wounded and killed, is above what could have been expected (v. 24, 8). Rüstow and Köchly (p. 273) state that in modern battles, the ordinary proportion of wounded to killed is from 8:1 to 10:1.

armed, and not likely to let themselves be slain with impunity; moreover Plutarch expressly affirms that they resisted with desperate valour, and that most of the Macedonian loss was incurred in the conflict against them. It is not easy therefore to comprehend how the total number of slain can be brought within the statement of Arrian[1].

Alexander's kindness to his wounded soldiers, and severe treatment of the Grecian prisoners.

After the victory, Alexander manifested the greatest solicitude for his wounded soldiers, whom he visited and consoled in person. Of the twenty-five Companions slain, he caused brazen statues, by Lysippus, to be erected at Dium in Macedonia, where they were still standing in the time of Arrian. To the surviving relatives of all the slain he also granted immunity from taxation and from personal service. The dead bodies were honourably buried, those of the enemy as well as of his own soldiers. The two thousand Greeks in the Persian service who had become his prisoners, were put in chains, and transported to Macedonia there to work as slaves; to which treatment Alexander condemned them on the ground that they had taken arms on behalf of the foreigner against Greece, in contravention of the general vote passed by the synod at Corinth. At the same time, he sent to Athens three hundred panoplies selected from the spoil, to be dedicated to Athênê in the acropolis with this inscription —"Alexander son of Philip, and the Greeks, except the Lacedæmonians (*present these*

[1] Arrian, i. 16, 8; Plutarch, Alexand. 16. Aristobulus (apud Plutarch. *l. c.*) said that there were slain, among the companions of Alexander (τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον) thirty-four persons, of whom nine were infantry. This coincides with Arrian's statement about the twenty-five companions of the cavalry, slain.

offerings), out of the spoils of the foreigners inhabiting Asia[1]." Though the vote to which Alexander appealed represented no existing Grecian aspiration; and granted only a sanction which could not be safely refused, yet he found satisfaction in clothing his own self-aggrandising impulse under the name of a supposed Pan-hellenic purpose: which was at the same time useful as strengthening his hold upon the Greeks, who were the only persons competent, either as officers or soldiers, to uphold the Persian empire against him. His conquests were the extinction of genuine Hellenism, though they diffused an exterior varnish of it, and especially the Greek language, over much of the Oriental world. True Grecian interests lay more on the side of Darius than of Alexander.

Unskilfulness of the Persian leaders. Immense impression produced by Alexander's victory.

The battle of the Granikus, brought on by Arsites and the other satraps contrary to the advice of Memnon, was moreover so unskilfully fought by them, that the gallantry of their infantry, the most formidable corps of Greeks that had ever been in the Persian service, was rendered of little use. The battle, properly speaking, was fought only by the Persian cavalry[2]; the infantry was left to be surrounded and destroyed afterwards.

No victory could be more decisive or terror-striking than that of Alexander. There remained no force in the field to oppose him. The impression made by so great a public catastrophe was en-

[1] Arrian, i. 16, 10, 11.

[2] Arrian usually calls the battle of the Granikus an *ἱππομαχία* (i. 17, 10, and elsewhere).

The battle was fought in the Attic month Thargelion: probably the beginning of May (Plutarch, Camillus, 19).

hanced by two accompanying circumstances; first, by the number of Persian grandees who perished, realising almost the wailings of Atossa, Xerxes, and the Chorus, in the Persæ of Æschylus[1], after the battle of Salamis—next, by the chivalrous and successful prowess of Alexander himself, who, emurating the Homeric Achilles, not only rushed foremost into the *mêlée*, but killed two of these grandees with his own hand. Such exploits, impressive even when we read of them now, must at the moment when they occurred have acted most powerfully upon the imagination of contemporaries.

Terror and submission of the Asiatics to Alexander. Surrender of the strong fortress of Sardis.

Several of the neighbouring Mysian mountaineers, though mutinous subjects towards Persia, came down to make submission to him, and were permitted to occupy their lands under the same tribute as they had paid before. The inhabitants of the neighbouring Grecian city of Zeleia, whose troops had served with the Persians, surrendered and obtained their pardon; Alexander admitting the plea that they had served only under constraint. He then sent Parmenio to attack Daskylium, the stronghold and chief residence of the satrap of Phrygia. Even this place was evacuated by the garrison and surrendered, doubtless with a considerable treasure therein. The whole satrapy of Phrygia thus fell into Alexander's power, and was appointed to be administered by Kallas for his behalf, levying the same amount of tribute as had been paid before[2]. He himself then marched, with his main force, in a southerly direction towards Sardis—the chief town of Lydia, and the main sta-

[1] Æschylus, Pers. 950 *seqq.*

[2] Arrian, i. 17, 1, 2.

tion of the Persians in Asia Minor. The citadel of Sardis—situated on a lofty and steep rock projecting from Mount Tmolus, fortified by a triple wall with an adequate garrison—was accounted impregnable, and at any rate could hardly have been taken by anything less than a long blockade[1], which would have allowed time for the arrival of the fleet and the operations of Memnon. Yet such was the terror which now accompanied the Macedonian conqueror, that when he arrived within eight miles of Sardis, he met not only a deputation of the chief citizens, but also the Persian governor of the citadel, Mithrines. The town, citadel, garrison, and treasure were delivered up to him without a blow. Fortunately for Alexander, there were not in Asia any Persian governors of courage and fidelity such as had been displayed by Maskames and Boges after the repulse of Xerxes from Greece[2]. Alexander treated Mithrines with courtesy and honour, granted freedom to the Sardians and to the other Lydians generally, with the use of their own Lydian laws. The betrayal of Sardis by Mithrines was a signal good fortune to Alexander. On going up to the citadel, he contemplated with astonishment its prodigious strength; congratulating himself on so easy an acquisition, and giving directions to build there a temple of Olympian Zeus, on the spot where the old palace of the kings of Lydia had been situated. He named Pausanias governor of the citadel, with

[1] About the almost impregnable fortifications and position of Sardis, see Polybius, vii. 15–18; Herod. i. 84. It held out for nearly two years against Antiochus III. (B.C. 216), and was taken at last only by the extreme carelessness of the defenders; even then, the citadel was still held.

[2] Herodot. vii. 106, 107.

a garrison of Peloponnesians from Argos; Asander, satrap of the country; and Nikias, collector of tribute[1]. The freedom granted to the Lydians, whatever it may have amounted to, did not exonerate them from paying the usual tribute.

He marches from Sardis to the coast. Capture of Ephesus.

From Sardis, he ordered Kallas, the new satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia—and Alexander son of Aëropus, who had been promoted in place of Kallas to the command of the Thessalian cavalry—to attack Atarneus and the district belonging to Memnon, on the Asiatic coast opposite Lesbos. Meanwhile he himself directed his march to Ephesus, which he reached on the fourth day. Both at Ephesus and at Miletus—the two principal strongholds of the Persians on the coast, as Sardis was in the interior—the sudden catastrophe at the Granikus had struck unspeakable terror. Hegesistratus, governor of the Persian garrison (Greek mercenaries) at Miletus, sent letters to Alexander offering to surrender the town on his approach; while the garrison at Ephesus, with the Macedonian exile Amyntas, got on board two triremes in the harbour, and fled. It appears that there had been recently a political revolution in the town, conducted by Syrphax and other leaders, who had established an oligarchical government. These men, banishing their political opponents, had committed depredations on the temple of Artemis, overthrown the statue of Philip of Macedon dedicated therein, and destroyed the sepulchre of Heropythus the liberator in the agora[2].

[1] Arrian, i. 17, 5-9; Diodor. xvii. 21.

[2] Arrian, i. 17, 12. Respecting these commotions at Ephesus, which had preceded the expedition of Alexander, we have no information:

Some of the party, though abandoned by their garrison, were still trying to invoke aid from Memnon, who however was yet at a distance. Alexander entered the town without resistance, restored the exiles, established a democratical constitution, and directed that the tribute heretofore paid to the Persians should now be paid to the Ephesian Artemis. Syrphax and his family sought refuge in the temple, from whence they were dragged by the people and stoned to death. More of the same party would have been despatched, had not the popular vengeance been restrained by Alexander; who displayed an honourable and prudent moderation[1].

He finds the first resistance at Miletus.

Thus master of Ephesus, Alexander found himself in communication with his fleet, under the command of Nikanor; and received propositions of surrender from the two neighbouring inland cities, Magnesia and Tralleis. To occupy these cities, he despatched Parmenio with 5000 foot (half of them Macedonians) and 200 of the Companion-cavalry; while he at the same time sent Antimachus with an equal force in a northerly direction, to liberate the various cities of Æolic and Ionic Greeks. This officer was instructed to put down in each of them the ruling oligarchy, which acted with a mercenary garrison as an instrument of Persian supremacy—to place the government in the hands of

nor are we told who Heropythus was, or under what circumstances he had liberated Ephesus. It would have been interesting to know these facts, as illustrating the condition of the Asiatic Greeks previous to Alexander's invasion.

[1] Arrian, i. 17, 10–13.

the citizens—and to abolish all payment of tribute. He himself—after taking part in a solemn festival and procession to the temple of Ephesian Artemis, with his whole army in battle array—marched southward towards Miletus; his fleet under Nikanor proceeding thither by sea[1]. He expected probably to enter Miletus with as little resistance as Ephesus. But his hopes were disappointed: Hegesistratus, commander of the garrison in that town, though under the immediate terror of the defeat at the Granikus he had written to offer submission, had now altered his tone, and determined to hold out. The formidable Persian fleet[2], four hundred sail of Phenician and Cyprian ships of war with well-trained seamen, was approaching.

Near approach of the Persian fleet. Memnon is made commander-in-chief of the Persians.

This naval force, which a few weeks earlier would have prevented Alexander from crossing into Asia, now afforded the only hope of arresting the rapidity and ease of his conquests. What steps had been taken by the Persian officers since the defeat at the Granikus, we do not hear. Many of them had fled, along with Memnon, to Miletus[3]; and they were probably disposed, under the present desperate circumstances, to accept the command of Memnon as their only hope of safety, though they had despised his counsel on the day of the battle. Whether the towns in Memnon's principality of Atarneus had attempted any resistance against the Macedonians, we do not know. His interests however were so closely identified with those of Persia, that he had sent up his wife and children as hostages, to induce

[1] Arrian, i. 18, 5, 6.
[2] Arrian, i. 18, 10–13.
[3] Diodor. xvii. 22.

Darius to entrust him with the supreme conduct of the war. Orders to this effect were presently sent down by that prince[1]; but at the first arrival of the fleet, it seems not to have been under the command of Memnon, who was however probably on board.

The Macedonian fleet occupies the harbour of Miletus, and keeps out the Persians. Alexander declines naval combat. His debate with Parmenio.

It came too late to aid in the defence of Miletus. Three days before its arrival, Nikanor the Macedonian admiral, with his fleet of one hundred and sixty ships, had occupied the island of Ladê, which commanded the harbour of that city. Alexander found the outer portion of Miletus evacuated, and took it without resistance. He was making preparations to besiege the inner city, and had already transported 4000 troops across to the island of Ladê, when the powerful Persian fleet came in sight, but found itself excluded from Miletus, and obliged to take moorings under the neighbouring promontory of Mykalê. Unwilling to abandon without a battle the command of the sea, Parmenio advised Alexander to fight this fleet, offering himself to share the hazard aboard. But Alexander disapproved the proposition, affirming that his fleet was inferior not less in skill than in numbers; that the high training of the Macedonians would tell for nothing on shipboard; and that a naval defeat would be the signal for insurrection in Greece. Besides debating such prudential reasons, Alexander and Parmenio also differed about the religious promise of the case. On the sea-shore, near the stern of the Macedonian ships, Parmenio had seen an eagle, which filled him with confidence that the ships would prove victorious. But Alex-

[1] Diodor. xvii. 23.

ander contended that this interpretation was incorrect. Though the eagle doubtless promised to him victory, yet it had been seen on land—and therefore his victories would be on land: hence the result signified was, that he would overcome the Persian fleet, by means of land-operations[1]. This part of the debate, between two practical military men of ability, is not the least interesting of the whole; illustrating as it does, not only the religious susceptibilities of the age, but also the pliancy of the interpretative process, lending itself equally well to inferences totally opposite. The difference between a sagacious and a dull-witted prophet, accommodating ambiguous omens to useful or mischievous conclusions, was one of very material importance in the ancient world.

Alexander besieges Miletus. Capture of the city.

Alexander now prepared vigorously to assault Miletus, repudiating with disdain an offer brought to him by a Milesian citizen named Glaukippus—that the city should be neutral and open to him as well as to the Persians. His fleet under Nikanor occupied the harbour, blocked up its narrow mouth against the Persians, and made threatening demonstrations from the water's edge; while he himself brought up his battering-engines against the walls, shook or overthrew them in several places, and then stormed the city. The Milesians, with the Grecian mercenary garrison, made a brave defence, but were overpowered by the impetuosity of the assault. A large number of them were slain, and there was no way of escape except by jumping into little boats, or swimming off upon the hollow of the

[1] Arrian, i. 18, 9-15; i. 20, 2.

shield. Even of these fugitives, most part were killed by the seamen of the Macedonian triremes; but a division of 300 Grecian mercenaries got on to an isolated rock near the mouth of the harbour, and there prepared to sell their lives dearly. Alexander, as soon as his soldiers were thoroughly masters of the city, went himself on shipboard to attack the mercenaries on the rock, taking with him ladders in order to effect a landing upon it. But when he saw that they were resolved on a desperate defence, he preferred admitting them to terms of capitulation, and received them into his own service[1]. To the surviving Milesian citizens he granted the condition of a free city, while he caused all the remaining prisoners to be sold as slaves.

The Persian fleet retires to Halikarnassus. Alexander disbands his own fleet.

The powerful Persian fleet, from the neighbouring promontory of Mykalê, was compelled to witness, without being able to prevent, the capture of Miletus, and was presently withdrawn to Halikarnassus. At the same time Alexander came to the resolution of disbanding his own fleet; which, while costing more than he could then afford, was nevertheless unfit to cope with the enemy in open sea. He calculated that by concentrating all his efforts on land-operations, especially against the cities on the coast, he should exclude the Persian fleet from all effective hold on Asia Minor, and ensure that country to himself. He therefore paid off all the ships, retaining only a moderate squadron for the purposes of transport[2].

[1] Arrian, i. 19; Diodor. xvii. 22.

[2] Arrian, i. 20, 1-4; Diodor. xvii. 22. At the same time, the state-

March of Alexander to Halikarnassus. Ada queen of Karia joins him.

Before this time, probably, the whole Asiatic coast northward of Miletus—including the Ionic and Æolic cities and the principality of Memnon—had either accepted willingly the dominion of Alexander, or had been reduced by his detachments. Accordingly he now directed his march southward from Miletus, towards Karia, and especially towards Halikarnassus, the principal city of that territory. On entering Karia, he was met by Ada, a member of the Karian princely family, who tendered to him her town of Alinda and her other possessions, adopting him as her son, and entreating his protection. Not many years earlier, under Mausôlus and Artemisia, the powerful princes of this family had been formidable to all the Grecian islands. It was the custom of Karia that brothers and sisters of the reigning family intermarried with each other: Mausôlus and his wife Artemisia were succeeded by Idrieus and his wife Ada, all four being brothers and sisters, sons and daughters of Hekatomnus. On the death of Idrieus, his widow Ada was expelled from Halikarnassus and other parts of Karia by her surviving brother Pixodarus; though she still retained some strong towns, which proved a welcome addition to the conquests of Alexander. Pixodarus, on the contrary, who had given his daughter in marriage to a leading Persian named Orontobates, warmly espoused the Persian cause, and made Halikarnassus a capital point of resistance against the invader[1].

ment of Diodorus can hardly be correct (xvii. 24), that Alexander sent his battering engines from Miletus to Halikarnassus by sea. This would only have exposed them to be captured by the Persian fleet.

We shall see that Alexander reorganised his entire fleet during the ensuing year.

[1] Arrian, i. 23, 11, 12; Diodor. xvii. 24; Strabo, xiv. p. 657.

Strong garrison, and good defensive preparation, at Halikarnassus.

But it was not by him alone that this city was defended. The Persian fleet had repaired thither from Miletus; Memnon, now invested by Darius with supreme command on the Asiatic coast and the Ægean, was there in person. There was not only Orontobates with many other Asiatics, but also a large garrison of mercenary Greeks, commanded by Ephiáltes, a brave Athenian exile. The city, strong both by nature and by art, with a surrounding ditch forty-five feet broad and twenty-two feet deep[1], had been still farther strengthened under the prolonged superintendence of Memnon[2]; lastly, there were two citadels, a fortified harbour with its entrance fronting the south, abundant magazines of arms, and good provision of defensive engines. The siege of Halikarnassus was the most arduous enterprise which Alexander had yet undertaken. Instead of attacking it by land and sea at once, as at Miletus, he could make his approaches only from the land, while the defenders were powerfully aided from seaward by the Persian ships with their numerous crews.

Siege of Halikarnassus. Bravery of the garrison, under Ephialtes the Athenian.

His first efforts, directed against the gate on the north or north-east of the city, which led towards Mylasa, were interrupted by frequent sallies and discharges from the engines on the walls. After a few days thus spent without much avail, he passed with a large section of his army to the western side of the town, towards the outlying portion of the projecting tongue of land, on which Halikarnassus and Myndus (the latter farther westward)

[1] Arrian, i. 20, 13.

[2] Arrian, i. 20, 5. *ξύμπαντα ταῦτα Μέμνων τε αὐτὸς παρὼν ἐκ πολλοῦ παρεσκευάκει*, &c.

were situated. While making demonstrations on this side of Halikarnassus, he at the same time attempted a night attack on Myndus, but was obliged to retire after some hours of fruitless effort. He then confined himself to the siege of Halikarnassus. His soldiers, protected from missiles by moveable penthouses (called Tortoises), gradually filled up the wide and deep ditch round the town, so as to open a level road for his engines (rolling towers of wood) to come up close to the walls. The engines being brought up close, the work of demolition was successfully prosecuted; notwithstanding vigorous sallies from the garrison, repulsed, though not without loss and difficulty, by the Macedonians. Presently the shock of the battering-engines had overthrown two towers of the city-wall, together with two intermediate breadths of wall; and a third tower was beginning to totter. The besieged were employed in erecting an inner wall of brick to cover the open space, and a wooden tower of the great height of 150 feet for the purpose of casting projectiles[1]. It appears that Alexander waited for the full demolition of the third tower, before he thought the breach wide enough to be stormed; but an assault was prematurely brought on by two adventurous soldiers from the division of Perdikkas[2]. These men, elate with wine, rushed up singlehanded to attack the Mylasean gate, and slew the foremost of the defenders who came out to

[1] Compare Arrian, i. 21, 7, 8; Diodor. xvii. 25, 26.

[2] Both Arrian (i. 21, 5) and Diodorus (xvii. 25) mention this proceeding of the two soldiers of Perdikkas, though Diodorus says that it occurred at night, which cannot well be true.

oppose them, until at length, reinforcements arriving successively on both sides, a general combat took place at a short distance from the wall. In the end, the Macedonians were victorious, and drove the besieged back into the city. Such was the confusion, that the city might then have been assaulted and taken, had measures been prepared for it beforehand. The third tower was speedily overthrown; nevertheless, before this could be accomplished, the besieged had already completed their half-moon within, against which accordingly, on the next day, Alexander pushed forward his engines. In this advanced position, however, being as it were within the circle of the city-wall, the Macedonians were exposed to discharges not only from engines in their front, but also from the towers yet standing on each side of them. Moreover, at night, a fresh sally was made with so much impetuosity, that some of the covering wicker-work of the engines, and even the main woodwork of one of them, was burnt. It was not without difficulty that Philôtas and Hellanikus, the officers on guard, preserved the remainder; nor were the besieged finally driven in, until Alexander himself appeared with reinforcements[1]. Though his troops had been victors in these successive combats, yet he could not carry off his dead, who lay close to the walls, without soliciting a truce for burial. Such request usually counted as a confession of defeat: nevertheless Alexander solicited the truce, which was granted by Memnon, in spite of the contrary opinion of Ephialtes[2].

After a few days of interval, for burying his dead

[1] Arrian, i. 21, 7-12. [2] Diodor. xvii. 25.

and repairing the engines, Alexander recommenced attack upon the half-moon, under his own personal superintendence. Among the leaders within, a conviction gained ground that the place could not long hold out. Ephialtes especially, resolved not to survive the capture, and seeing that the only chance of preservation consisted in destroying the besieging engines, obtained permission from Memnon to put himself at the head of a last desperate sally[1]. He took immediately near him 2000 chosen troops, half to encounter the enemy, half with torches to burn the engines. At daybreak, all the gates being suddenly and simultaneously thrown open, sallying parties rushed out from each against the besiegers; the engines from within supporting them by multiplied discharges of missiles. Ephialtes with his division, marching straight against the Macedonians on guard at the main point of attack, assailed them impetuously, while his torch-bearers tried to set the

Desperate sally of Ephialtes—at first successful, but repulsed—he himself is slain.

[1] The last desperate struggle of the besieged, is, what stands described in i. 22 of Arrian, and in xvii. 26, 27 of Diodorus; though the two descriptions are very different. Arrian does not name Ephialtes at Halikarnassus. He follows the Macedonian authors, Ptolemy and Aristobulus; who probably dwelt only on Memnon and the Persians as their real enemies, treating the Greeks in general as a portion of the hostile force. On the other hand, Diodorus and Curtius appear to have followed, in great part, Grecian authors; in whose view eminent Athenian exiles, like Ephialtes and Charidemus, counted for much more.

The fact here mentioned by Diodorus, that Ephialtes drove back the young Macedonian guard, and that the battle was restored only by the extraordinary efforts of the old guard—is one of much interest, which I see no reason for mistrusting, though Arrian says nothing about it. Curtius (v. 2; viii. 1) makes allusion to it on a subsequent occasion, naming Atharrias: the part of his work in which it ought to have been narrated, is lost. On this, as on other occasions, Arrian slurs over the partial reverses, obstructions, and losses, of Alexander's career. His authorities probably did so before him.

engines on fire. Himself distinguished no less for personal strength than for valour, he occupied the front rank, and was so well seconded by the courage and good array of his soldiers charging in deep column, that for a time he gained advantage. Some of the engines were successfully fired, and the advanced guard of the Macedonian troops, consisting of young troops, gave way and fled. They were rallied partly by the efforts of Alexander, but still more by the older Macedonian soldiers, companions in all Philip's campaigns; who, standing exempt from night-watches, were encamped more in the rear. These veterans, among whom one Atharrias was the most conspicuous, upbraiding the cowardice of their comrades[1], cast themselves into their accustomed phalanx-array, and thus both withstood and repulsed the charge of the victorious enemy. Ephialtes, foremost among the combatants, was slain, the rest were driven back to the city, and the burning engines were saved with some damage. During this same time, an obstinate conflict had also taken place at the gate called Tripylon, where the besieged had made another sally, over a narrow bridge thrown across the ditch. Here the Macedonians were under the command of Ptolemy (not the son of Lagus), one of the king's body-guards. He, with two or three other conspicuous officers, perished in the severe struggle which ensued, but the sallying party were at length repulsed and driven

[1] Diodor. xvi. 27; Curtius, v. 1. viii. 2. .....*οἱ γὰρ πρεσβύτατοι τῶν Μακεδόνων, διὰ μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀπολελυμένοι τῶν κινδύνων, συνεστρατευμένοι δὲ Φιλίππῳ.....τοῖς μὲν φυγομαχοῦσι νεωτέροις πικρῶς ὠνείδισαν τὴν ἀνανδρίαν, αὐτοὶ δὲ συναθροισθέντες καὶ συνασπίσαντες, ὑπέστησαν τοὺς δοκοῦντας ἤδη νενικηκέναι*.....

into the city[1]. The loss of the besieged was severe, in trying to get again within the walls, under vigorous pursuit from the Macedonians.

Memnon is forced to abandon Halikarnassus, and withdraw the garrison by sea, retaining only the citadel. Alexander enters Halikarnassus.

By this last unsuccessful effort, the defensive force of Halikarnassus was broken. Memnon and Orontobates, satisfied that no longer defence of the town was practicable, took advantage of the night to set fire to their wooden projectile engines and towers, as well as to their magazines of arms, with the houses near the exterior wall, while they carried away the troops, stores, and inhabitants, partly to the citadel called Salmakis—partly to the neighbouring islet called Arkonnesus—partly to the island of Kos[2]. Though thus evacuating the town, however, they still kept good garrisons well-provisioned in the two citadels belonging to it. The conflagration, stimulated by a strong wind, spread widely. It was only extinguished by the orders of Alexander, when he entered the town, and put to death all those whom he found with firebrands. He directed that the Halikarnassians found in the houses should be spared, but that the city itself should be demolished. He assigned the whole of Karia to Ada, as a principality, doubtless under condition of tribute. As the citadels still occupied by the enemy were strong enough to require a long siege, he did not think it necessary to remain in person for the purpose of reducing them; but surrounding them with a wall of blockade, he left Ptolemy and 3000 men to guard it[3].

Having concluded the siege of Halikarnassus, B.C. 334–333, winter.

[1] Arrian, i. 22, 5. [2] Arrian, i. 23, 3, 4; Diodor. xvii. 27.
[3] Arrian, i. 23, 11; Diodor. xvii. 7; Strabo, xiv. p. 657.

Alexander sent back his artillery to Tralles, ordering Parmenio, with a large portion of the cavalry, the allied infantry, and the baggage waggons, to Sardis.

B.C. 334–333, winter. Winter campaign of Alexander along the southern coast of Asia Minor.

The ensuing winter months he employed in the conquest of Lykia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia. All this southern coast of Asia Minor is mountainous; the range of Mount Taurus descending nearly to the sea, so as to leave little or no intervening breadth of plain. In spite of great strength of situation, such was the terror of Alexander's arms, that all the Lykian towns—Hyparna, Telmissus, Pinara, Xanthus, Patara, and thirty others—submitted to him without a blow[1]. One alone among them, called Marmareis, resisted to desperation[2]. On reaching the territory called Milyas, the Phrygian frontier of Lykia, Alexander received the surrender of the Greek maritime city, Phasêlis. He assisted the Phaselites in destroying a mountain fort erected and garrisoned against them by the neighbouring Pisidian mountaineers, and paid a public compliment to the sepulchre of their deceased townsman, the rhetorician Theodektes[3].

After this brief halt at Phasêlis, Alexander directed his course to Pergê in Pamphylia. The ordinary mountain road, by which he sent most of his army, was so difficult as to require some leveling by Thracian light troops sent in advance for the purpose. But the king himself, with a select detachment, took a road more difficult still, under the mountains by the brink of the sea, called Klimax. When the wind blew from the south, this

[1] Arrian, i. 24, 6–9. [2] Diodor. xvii. 28.
[3] Arrian, i. 24, 11; Plutarch, Alexand. 17.

road was covered by such a depth of water as to be impracticable; for some time before he reached the spot, the wind had blown strong from the south —but as he came near, the special providence of the Gods (so he and his friends conceived it) brought on a change to the north, so that the sea receded and left an available passage, though his soldiers had the water up to their waists[1]. From Pergê he marched on to Sidê, receiving on his way envoys from Aspendus, who offered to surrender their city, but deprecated the entrance of a garrison; which they were allowed to buy off by promising fifty talents in money, together with the horses which they were bringing up as tribute for the Persian king. Having left a garrison at Sidê, he advanced onward to a strong place called Syllium, defended by brave natives with a body of mercenaries to aid them. These men held out, and even repulsed a first assault; which Alexander could not stay to repeat, being apprised that the Aspendians had refused to execute the conditions imposed, and had put their city in a state of defence. Returning rapidly, he constrained them to submission, and then marched back to Pergê; from whence he directed his course towards the greater Phrygia[2], through the difficult mountains, and almost indomitable population, of Pisidia.

After remaining in the Pisidian mountains long enough to reduce several towns or strong posts,

[1] Arrian, i. 26, 4. οὐκ ἄνευ τοῦ θείου, ὡς αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἐξηγοῦντο, &c. Strabo, xiv. p. 666; Curtius, v. 3, 22.

Plutarch's words (Alexand. 17) must be taken to mean that Alexander did not boast so much of this special favour from the Gods, as some of his panegyrists boasted for him.

[2] Arrian, i. 27, 1–8.

Alexander concludes his winter campaign at Gordium. Capture of Kelænæ.

Alexander proceeded northward into Phrygia, passing by the salt lake called Askanius to the steep and impregnable fortress of Kelænæ, garrisoned by 1000 Karians, and 100 mercenary Greeks. These men, having no hope of relief from the Persians, offered to deliver up the fortress, unless such relief should arrive before the sixtieth day[1]. Alexander accepted the propositions, remained ten days at Kelænæ, and left there Antigonus (afterwards the most powerful among his successors) as satrap of Phrygia, with 1500 men. He then marched northward to Gordium on the river Sangarius, where Parmenio was directed to meet him, and where his winter-campaign was concluded[2].

[1] Curtius, iii. 1, 8.

[2] Arrian, i. 29, 1-5.

APPENDIX.

ON THE LENGTH OF THE MACEDONIAN SARISSA OR PIKE.

The statements here given about the length of the sarissa carried by the phalangite, are taken from Polybius, whose description is on all points both clear and consistent with itself. "The sarissa (he says) is sixteen cubits long, according to the original theory; and fourteen cubits, as adapted to actual practice"—*τὸ δὲ τῶν σαρισσῶν μέγεθός ἐστι, κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπόθεσιν, ἐκκαίδεκα πηχῶν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἁρμογὴν τὴν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, δεκατεσσάρων. Τούτων δὲ τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀφαιρεῖ τὸ μεταξὺ ταῖν χεροῖν διάστημα, καὶ τὸ κατόπιν σήκωμα τῆς προβολῆς* (xviii. 12).

The difference here indicated by Polybius between the length in theory, and that in practice, may probably be understood to mean, that the phalangites, when in exercise, used pikes of the

greater length; when on service, of the smaller: just as the Roman soldiers were trained in their exercises to use arms heavier than they employed against an enemy.

Of the later Tactic writers, Leo (Tact. vi. 39) and Constantine Porphyrogenitus, repeat the double measurement of the sarissa as given by Polybius. Arrian (Tact. c. 12) and Polyænus (ii. 29, 2) state its length at sixteen cubits—Ælian (Tact. c. 14) gives fourteen cubits. All these authors follow either Polybius, or some other authority concurrent with him. None of them contradict him, though none state the case so clearly as he does.

Messrs. Rüstow and Köchly (Gesch. des Griech. Kriegswesens, p. 238), authors of the best work that I know respecting ancient military matters, reject the authority of Polybius as it here stands. They maintain that the passage must be corrupt, and that Polybius must have meant to say that the sarissa was sixteen *feet* in length—not sixteen *cubits*. I cannot subscribe to their opinion, nor do I think that their criticism on Polybius is a just one.

First, they reason as if Polybius had said that the sarissa of actual service was *sixteen* cubits long. Computing the weight of such a weapon from the thickness required in the shaft, they pronounce that it would be unmanageable. But Polybius gives the actual length as only *fourteen* cubits: a very material difference. If we accept the hypothesis of these authors—that corruption of the text has made us read *cubits* where we ought to have read *feet*,—it will follow that the length of the sarissa, as given by Polybius, would be *fourteen feet*, not *sixteen feet*. Now this length is not sufficient to justify various passages in which its prodigious length is set forth.

Next, they impute to Polybius a contradiction in saying that the Roman soldier occupied a space of three feet, equal to that occupied by a Macedonian soldier — and yet that in the fight, he had two Macedonian soldiers and ten pikes, opposed to him (xviii. 13). But there is here no contradiction at all: for Polybius expressly says that the Roman, though occupying three feet when the legion was drawn up in order, required, when fighting, an expansion of the ranks and an increased interval to the extent of three feet behind him and on each side of him (χάλασμα καὶ διάστασιν ἀλλήλων ἔχειν δεήσει τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐλάχιστον τρεῖς πόδας κατ' ἐπιστάτην καὶ παραστάτην) in order to allow full play for his sword and shield. It is therefore perfectly true that each

Roman soldier, when actually marching up to attack the phalanx, occupied as much ground as two phalangites, and had ten pikes to deal with.

Farther, it is impossible to suppose that Polybius, in speaking of *cubits*, really meant *feet*: because (cap. 12) he speaks of *three feet* as the interval between each rank in the file, and these *three feet* are clearly made equal to *two cubits*. His computation will not come right, if in place of *cubits* you substitute *feet*.

We must therefore take the assertion of Polybius as we find it: that the pike of the phalangite was fourteen cubits or twenty-one feet in length. Now Polybius had every means of being well informed on such a point. He was above thirty years of age at the time of the last war of the Romans against the Macedonian king Perseus, in which war he himself served. He was intimately acquainted with Scipio, the son of Paulus Emilius, who gained the battle of Pydna. Lastly, he had paid great attention to tactics, and had even written an express work on the subject.

It might indeed be imagined, that the statement of Polybius, though true as to his own time, was not true as to the time of Philip and Alexander. But there is nothing to countenance such a suspicion—which moreover is expressly disclaimed by Rüstow and Köchly.

Doubtless twenty-one feet is a prodigious length, unmanageable except by men properly trained, and inconvenient for all evolutions. But these are just the terms under which the pike of the phalangite is always spoken of. So Livy, xxxi. 39, "Erant pleraque silvestria circa, incommoda phalangi maximè Macedonum: quæ, nisi ubi *prælongis hastis* velut vallum ante clypeos objecit (quod ut fiat, libero campo opus est) nullius admodum usus est." Compare also Livy, xliv. 40, 41, where, among other intimations of the immense length of the pike, we find, "Si carptim aggrediendo, circumagere *immobilem longitudine et gravitate hastam* cogas, confusâ strue implicatur:" also xxxiii. 8, 9.

Xenophon tells us that the Ten Thousand Greeks in their retreat had to fight their way across the territory of the Chalybes, who carried a pike *fifteen cubits* long, together with a short sword: he does not mention a shield, but they wore greaves and helmets (Anab. iv. 7, 15). This is a length greater than what Polybius ascribes to the pike of the Macedonian phalangite. The Mosynœki defended their citadel "with pikes so long and thick that a

man could hardly carry them" (Anabas. v. 4, 25). In the Iliad, when the Trojans are pressing hard upon the Greek ships, and seeking to set them on fire, Ajax is described as planting himself upon the poop, and keeping off the assailants with a thrusting-pike of twenty-two cubits or thirty-three feet in length (ξυστὸν ναύμαχον ἐν παλάμῃσιν—δυωκαιεικοσίπηχυ, Iliad, xv. 678). The spear of Hektor is ten cubits, or eleven cubits, in length—intended to be hurled (Iliad, vi. 319; viii. 494)—the reading is not settled, whether ἔγχος ἔχ' ἐνδεκάπηχυ, or ἔγχος ἔχεν δεκάπηχυ.

The Swiss infantry, and the German Landsknechte, in the sixteenth century, were in many respects a reproduction of the Macedonian phalanx: close ranks, deep files, long pikes, and the three or four first ranks composed of the strongest and bravest men in the regiment—either officers, or picked soldiers receiving double pay. The length and impenetrable array of their pikes enabled them to resist the charge of the heavy cavalry or men at arms: they were irresistible in front, unless an enemy could find means to break in among the pikes, which was sometimes, though rarely, done. Their great confidence was in the length of the pike—Macciavelli says of them (Ritratti dell' Alamagna, Opere, t. iv. p. 159; and Dell' Arte della Guerra, p. 232-236), "Dicono tenere tale ordine, che non è possibile entrare tra loro, nè accostarseli, quanto è la picca lunga. Sono ottime genti in campagna; à far giornata: ma per espugnare terre non vagliono, e poco nel difenderlo: ed universalmente, dove non possano tenere l' ordine loro della milizia, non vagliono."

CHAPTER XCIII.

SECOND AND THIRD ASIATIC CAMPAIGNS OF ALEXANDER—BATTLE OF ISSUS—SIEGE OF TYRE.

B.C. 333. Alexander cuts the Gordian knot.

IT was about February or March 333 B.C., when Alexander reached Gordium; where he appears to have halted for some time, giving to the troops who had been with him in Pisidia a repose doubtless needful. While at Gordium, he performed the memorable exploit familiarly known as the cutting of the Gordian knot. There was preserved in the citadel an ancient waggon of rude structure, said by the legend to have once belonged to the peasant Gordius and his son Midas—the primitive rustic kings of Phrygia, designated as such by the Gods, and chosen by the people. The cord (composed of fibres from the bark of the cornel tree), attaching the yoke of this waggon to the pole, was so twisted and entangled as to form a knot of singular complexity, which no one had ever been able to untie. An oracle had pronounced, that to the person who should untie it the empire of Asia was destined. When Alexander went up to see this ancient relic, the surrounding multitude, Phrygian as well as Macedonian, were full of expectation that the conqueror of the Granikus and of Halikarnassus would overcome the difficulties of the knot and acquire the promised empire. But Alexander, on inspecting the knot, was as much perplexed as others had been before him, until at length, in a fit of impatience,

he drew his sword and severed the cord in two. By every one this was accepted as a solution of the problem; thus making good his title to the empire of Asia; a belief which the Gods ratified by a storm of thunder and lightning during the ensuing night[1].

He refuses the liberation of the Athenian prisoners.

At Gordium, Alexander was visited by envoys from Athens, entreating the liberation of the Athenian prisoners taken at the Granikus, who were now at work chained in the Macedonian mines. But he refused this prayer until a more convenient season. Aware that the Greeks were held attached to him only by their fears, and that, if opportunity occurred, a large fraction of them would take part with the Persians, he did not think it prudent to relax his hold upon their conduct[2].

B.C. 333.

Progress of Memnon and the Persian fleet—they acquire Chios and a large part of Lesbos—they besiege Mitylene. Death of Memnon. Capture of Mitylene.

Such opportunity seemed now not unlikely to occur. Memnon, excluded from efficacious action on the continent since the loss of Halikarnassus, was employed among the islands of the Ægean (during the first half of 333 B.C.), with the purpose of carrying war into Greece and Macedonia. Invested with the most ample command, he had a large Phenician fleet and a considerable body of Grecian mercenaries, together with his nephew Pharnabazus and the Persian Autophradates. Having acquired the important island of Chios, through the cooperation of a part of its inhabitants, he next landed on Lesbos, where four out of the five cities, either from fear or preference, declared in his favour; while Mitylênê, the greatest of the five, already occupied by a Macedonian garrison,

[1] Arrian, ii. 3; Curtius, iii. 2, 17; Plutarch, Alex. 18; Justin, xi. 7.
[2] Arrian, i. 29, 8.

stood out against him. Memnon accordingly disembarked his troops and commenced the blockade of the city both by sea and land, surrounding it with a double palisade wall from sea to sea. In the midst of this operation he died of sickness; but his nephew Pharnabazus, to whom he had consigned the command provisionally, until the pleasure of Darius could be known, prosecuted his measures vigorously, and brought the city to a capitulation. It was stipulated that the garrison introduced by Alexander should be dismissed; that the column, recording alliance with him, should be demolished; that the Mityleneans should become allies of Darius, upon the terms of the old convention called by the name of Antalkidas; and that the citizens in banishment should be recalled, with restitution of half their property. But Pharnabazus, as soon as admitted, violated the capitulation at once. He not only extorted contributions, but introduced a garrison under Lykomêdes, and established a returned exile named Diogenes as despot[1]. Such breach of faith was ill-calculated to assist the farther extension of Persian influence in Greece.

Hopes excited in Greece by the Persian fleet, but ruined by the death of Memnon.

Had the Persian fleet been equally active a year earlier, Alexander's army could never have landed in Asia. Nevertheless, the acquisitions of Chios and Lesbos, late as they were in coming, were highly important as promising future progress. Several of the Cyclades islands sent to tender their adhesion to the Persian cause; the fleet was expected in Eubœa, and the Spartans began to count upon aid for an anti-Macedonian movement[2]. But

[1] Arrian, ii. 1, 4-9.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 29.

all these hopes were destroyed by the unexpected decease of Memnon.

Memnon's death an irreparable mischief to Darius.

It was not merely the superior ability of Memnon, but also his established reputation both with Greeks and Persians, which rendered his death a fatal blow to the interests of Darius. The Persians had with them other Greek officers—brave and able—probably some not unfit to execute the full Memnonian schemes. But none of them had gone through the same experience in the art of exercising command among Orientals—none of them had acquired the confidence of Darius to the same extent, so as to be invested with the real guidance of operations, and upheld against court-calumnies. Though Alexander had now become master of Asia Minor, yet the Persians had ample means, if effectively used, of defending all that yet remained, and even of seriously disturbing him at home. But with Memnon vanished the last chance of employing these means with wisdom or energy. The full value of his loss was better appreciated by the intelligent enemy whom he opposed, than by the feeble master whom he served. The death of Memnon, lessening the efficiency of the Persians at sea, allowed full leisure to reorganize the Macedonian fleet[1], and to employ the undivided land-force for farther inland conquest[2].

If Alexander was a gainer in respect to his own operations by the death of this eminent Rhodian, he was yet more a gainer by the change of policy which that event induced Darius to adopt. The

[1] Arrian, ii. 2, 6; Curtius, iii. 3, 19; iii. 4, 8. "Nondum enim Memnonem vitâ excessisse cognoverat (Alexander)—satis gnarus, cuncta in expedito fore, si nihil ab eo moveretur."

[2] Diodor. xvi. 31.

Change in Darius's plan caused by this event. He resolves to take the offensive on land. His immense land-force.

Persian king resolved to renounce the defensive schemes of Memnon, and to take the offensive against the Macedonians on land. His troops, already summoned from the various parts of the empire, had partially arrived, and were still coming in[1]. Their numbers became greater and greater, amounting at length to a vast and multitudinous host, the total of which is given by some as 600,000 men—by others as 400,000 infantry and 100,000 cavalry. The spectacle of this showy and imposing mass, in every variety of arms, costume, and language, filled the mind of Darius with confidence; especially as there were among them between 20,000 and 30,000 Grecian mercenaries. The Persian courtiers, themselves elate and sanguine, stimulated and exaggerated the same feeling in the king himself, who became confirmed in his persuasion that his enemies could never resist him. From Sogdiana, Baktria, and India, the contingents had not yet had time to arrive; but most of those between the Persian Gulf and the Caspian sea had come in—Persians, Medes, Armenians, Derbikes, Barkanians, Hyrkanians, Kardakes, &c.; all of whom, mustered in the plains of Mesopotamia, are said to have been counted, like the troops of Xerxes in the plain of Doriskus, by paling off a space capable of containing exactly 10,000 men, and passing all the soldiers through it in succession[2]. Neither Darius himself, nor any of those

[1] Diodor. xvii. 30, 31. Diodorus represents the Persian king as having *begun* to issue letters of convocation for the troops, *after* he heard the death of Memnon; which cannot be true. The letters must have been sent out before.

[2] Curtius, iii. 2.

around him, had ever before seen so overwhelming a manifestation of the Persian imperial force. To an Oriental eye, incapable of appreciating the real conditions of military preponderance,—accustomed only to the gross and visible computation of numbers and physical strength,—the king who marched forth at the head of such an army appeared like a God on earth, certain to trample down all before him—just as most Greeks had conceived respecting Xerxes[1], and by stronger reason Xerxes respecting himself, a century and a half before. Because all this turned out a ruinous mistake, the description of the feeling, given in Curtius and Diodorus, is often mistrusted as baseless rhetoric. Yet it is in reality the self-suggested illusion of untaught men, as opposed to trained and scientific judgment.

Free speech and sound judgment of Charidemus. He is put to death by Darius.

But though such was the persuasion of Orientals, it found no response in the bosom of an intelligent Athenian. Among the Greeks now near Darius, was the Athenian exile Charidemus; who having incurred the implacable enmity of Alexander, had been forced to quit Athens after the Macedonian capture of Thebes, and had fled together with Ephialtes to the Persians. Darius, elate with the apparent omnipotence of his army under review, and hearing but one voice of devoted concurrence from the courtiers around him, asked

[1] Herodot. vii. 56—and the colloquy between Xerxes and Demaratus, vii. 103, 104—where the language put by Herodotus into the mouth of Xerxes is natural and instructive. On the other hand, the superior penetration of Cyrus the younger expresses supreme contempt for the military inefficiency of an Asiatic multitude—Xenophon, Anabas. i. 7, 4. Compare the blunt language of the Arcadian Antiochus—Xen. Hellen. vii. i. 38; and Cyropæd. viii. 8, 20.

the opinion of Charidemus, in full expectation of receiving an affirmative reply. So completely were the hopes of Charidemus bound up with the success of Darius, that he would not suppress his convictions, however unpalatable, at a moment when there was yet a possibility that they might prove useful. He replied (with the same frankness as Demaratus had once employed towards Xerxes), that the vast multitude now before him were unfit to cope with the comparatively small number of the invaders. He advised Darius to place no reliance on Asiatics, but to employ his immense treasures in subsidizing an increased army of Grecian mercenaries. He tendered his own hearty services either to assist or to command. To Darius, what he said was alike surprising and offensive; in the Persian courtiers, it provoked intolerable wrath. Intoxicated as they all were with the spectacle of their present muster, it seemed to them a combination of insult with absurdity, to pronounce Asiatics worthless as compared with Macedonians, and to teach the king that his empire could be defended by none but Greeks. They denounced Charidemus as a traitor who wished to acquire the king's confidence in order to betray him to Alexander. Darius, himself stung with the reply, and still farther exasperated by the clamours of his courtiers, seized with his own hands the girdle of Charidemus, and consigned him to the guards for execution. "You will discover too late (exclaimed the Athenian), the truth of what I have said. My avenger will soon be upon you[1]."

[1] Curtius, iii. 2, 10-20; Diodor. xvii. 30.

Filled as he now was with certain anticipations of success and glory, Darius resolved to assume in person the command of his army, and march down to overwhelm Alexander. From this moment, his land-army became the really important and aggressive force, with which he himself was to act. Herein we note his distinct abandonment of the plans of Memnon—the turning-point of his future fortune. He abandoned them, too, at the precise moment when they might have been most safely and completely executed. For at the time of the battle of the Granikus, when Memnon's counsel was originally given, the defensive part of it was not easy to act upon; since the Persians had no very strong or commanding position. But now, in the spring of 333 B.C., they had a line of defence as good as they could possibly desire; advantages, indeed, scarcely to be paralleled elsewhere. In the first place, there was the line of Mount Taurus, barring the entrance of Alexander into Kilikia; a line of defence (as will presently appear) nearly inexpugnable. Next, even if Alexander had succeeded in forcing this line and mastering Kilikia, there would yet remain the narrow road between Mount Amanus and the sea, called the Amanian Gates, and the Gates of Kilikia and Assyria—and after that, the passes over Mount Amanus itself—all indispensable for Alexander to pass through, and capable of being held, with proper precautions, against the strongest force of attack. A better opportunity, for executing the defensive part of Memnon's scheme, could not present itself; and he him-

Darius abandoned Memnon's plans, just at the time when he had the best defensive position for executing them with effect.

self must doubtless have reckoned that such advantages would not be thrown away.

Darius recalls the Grecian mercenaries from the fleet.

The momentous change of policy, on the part of the Persian king, was manifested by the order which he sent to the fleet after receiving intelligence of the death of Memnon. Confirming the appointment of Pharnabazus (made provisionally by the dying Memnon) as admiral, he at the same time dispatched Thymôdes (son of Mentor and nephew of Memnon) to bring away from the fleet the Grecian mercenaries who served aboard, to be incorporated with the main Persian army[1]. Here was a clear proof that the main stress of offensive operations was henceforward to be transferred from the sea to the land.

Criticism of Arrian on Darius's plan.

It is the more important to note such desertion of policy, on the part of Darius, as the critical turning-point in the Greco-Persian drama—because Arrian and the other historians leave it out of sight, and set before us little except secondary points in the case. Thus, for example, they condemn the imprudence of Darius, for coming to fight Alexander within the narrow space near Issus, instead of waiting for him on the spacious plains beyond Mount Amanus. Now, unquestionably, granting that a general battle was inevitable, this step augmented the chances in favour of the Macedonians. But it was a step upon which no material consequences turned; for the Persian army under Darius was hardly less unfit for a pitched battle in the open plain; as was afterwards proved at

[1] Arrian, ii. 2, 1; ii. 13, 3. Curtius, iii. 3, 1.

Arbela. The real imprudence—the neglect of the Memnonian warning—consisted in fighting the battle at all. Mountains and defiles were the real strength of the Persians, to be held as posts of defence against the invader. If Darius erred, it was not so much in relinquishing the open plain of Sochi, as in originally preferring that plain with a pitched battle, to the strong lines of defence offered by Taurus and Amanus.

The narrative of Arrian, exact perhaps in what it affirms, is not only brief and incomplete, but even omits on various occasions to put in relief the really important and determining points.

B.C. 333, summer. March of Alexander from Gordium through Paphlagonia and Kappadokia.

While halting at Gordium, Alexander was joined by those newly-married Macedonians whom he had sent home to winter, and who now came back with reinforcements to the number of 3000 infantry and 300 cavalry, together with 200 Thessalian cavalry, and 150 Eleians[1]. As soon as his troops had been sufficiently rested, he marched (probably about the latter half of May) towards Paphlagonia and Kappadokia. At Ankyra he was met by a deputation from the Paphlagonians, who submitted themselves to his discretion, only entreating that he would not conduct his army into their country. Accepting these terms, he placed them under the government of Kallas, his satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia. Advancing farther, he subdued the whole of Kappadokia, even to a considerable extent beyond the Halys, leaving therein Sabiktas as satrap[2].

Having established security in his rear, Alexan- B.C. 333

[1] Arrian, i. 29, 6.

[2] Arrian, ii. 4, 2; Curtius, iii. 1, 22; Plutarch, Alex. 18.

He arrives at the line of Mount Taurus—difficulties of the pass.

der marched southward towards Mount Taurus. He reached a post called the Camp of Cyrus, at the northern foot of that mountain, near the pass Tauri-pylæ, or Kilikian Gates, which forms the regular communication, between Kappadokia on the north side, and Kilikia on the south, of this great chain. The long road ascending and descending was generally narrow, winding, and rugged, sometimes between two steep and high banks; and it included, near its southern termination, one spot particularly obstructed and difficult. From ancient times, down to the present, the main road from Asia Minor into Kilikia and Syria has run through this pass. During the Roman empire, it must doubtless have received many improvements, so as to render the traffic comparatively easier. Yet the description given of it by modern travellers represents it to be as difficult as any road ever traversed by an army[1]. Seventy years before Alexander, it had been traversed by the younger Cyrus with the 10,000 Greeks, in his march up to attack his brother Artaxerxes; and Xenophon[2], who then went through it, pronounces it absolutely impracticable for an army, if opposed by any occupying

[1] Respecting this pass, see Vol. IX. Ch. lxix. p. 27 of the present History. There are now two passes over Taurus, from Erekli on the north side of the mountain—one the easternmost, descending upon Adana in Kilikia—the other, the westernmost, upon Tarsus. In the war (1832) between the Turks and Ibrahim Pacha, the Turkish commander left the westernmost pass undefended, so that Ibrahim Pacha passed from Tarsus along it without opposition. The Turkish troops occupied the easternmost pass, but defended themselves badly, so that the passage was forced by the Egyptians (Histoire de la Guerre de Mehemed Ali, par Cadalvène et Barrault, p. 243).

Alexander crossed Taurus by the easternmost of the two passes.

[2] Xenoph. Anabas. i. 2, 21; Diodor. xiv. 20.

force. So thoroughly persuaded was Cyrus himself of this fact, that he had prepared a fleet, in case he found the pass occupied, to land troops by sea in Kilikia in the rear of the defenders; and great indeed was his astonishment, to discover that the habitual recklessness of Persian management had left the defile unguarded. The narrowest part, while hardly sufficient to contain four armed men abreast, was shut in by precipitous rock on each side[1]. Here, if anywhere, was the spot in which the defensive policy of Memnon might have been made sure. To Alexander, inferior as he was by sea, the resource employed by the younger Cyrus was not open.

B.C. 333. Conduct of Arsames, the Persian satrap. Alexander passes Mount Taurus without the least resistance. He enters Tarsus.

Yet Arsames, the Persian satrap commanding at Tarsus in Kilikia, having received seemingly from his master no instructions, or worse than none, acted as if ignorant of the existence of his enterprising enemy north of Mount Taurus. On the first approach of Alexander, the few Persian soldiers occupying the pass fled without striking a blow, being seemingly unprepared for any enemy more formidable than mountain-robbers. Alexander thus became master of this almost insuperable barrier, without the loss of a man[2]. On the ensuing day, he marched his whole army over it into Kilikia, and arriving in a few hours at Tarsus, found the town already evacuated by Arsames[3].

[1] Curtius, iii. 4, 11.

[2] Curtius, iii. 4, 11. "Contemplatus locorum situm (Alexander), non alias dicitur magis admiratus esse felicitatem suam," &c.

See Plutarch, Demetrius, 47, where Agathokles (son of Lysimachus) holds the line of Taurus against Demetrius Poliorkêtes.

[3] Arrian, ii. 4, 3-8; Curtius, iii. 4. Curtius ascribes to Arsames the intention of executing what had been recommended by Memnon before

B.C. 333, summer.

Dangerous illness of Alexander. His confidence in the physician Philippus, who cures him.

At Tarsus Alexander made a long halt; much longer than he intended. Either from excessive fatigue—or from bathing while hot in the chilly water of the river Kydnus—he was seized with a violent fever, which presently increased to so dangerous a pitch that his life was despaired of. Amidst the grief and alarm with which this misfortune filled the army, none of the physicians would venture to administer remedies, from fear of being held responsible for what threatened to be a fatal result[1]. One alone among them, an Akarnanian named Philippus, long known and trusted by Alexander, engaged to cure him by a violent purgative draught. Alexander directed him to prepare it; but before the time for taking it arrived, he received a confidential letter from Parmenio, entreating him to beware of Philippus, who had been bribed by Darius to poison him. After reading the letter, he put it under his pillow. Presently came Philippus with the medicine, which Alexander accepted and swallowed without remark, at the same time giving Philippus the letter to read, and watching the expression of his countenance. The look, words, and gestures of the physician were such as completely to reassure him. Philippus, indignantly repudiating the calumny, repeated his full confidence in the medicine, and pledged himself to abide the result. At first it operated so violently as to make Alex-

the battle of the Granikus—to desolate the country in order to check Alexander's advance. But this can hardly be the right interpretation of the proceeding. Arrian's account seems more reasonable.

[1] When Hephæstion died of fever at Ekbatana, nine years afterwards, Alexander caused the physician who had attended him to be crucified (Plutarch, Alexand. 72; Arrian, vii. 14).

ander seemingly worse, and even to bring him to death's door; but after a certain interval, its healing effects became manifest. The fever was subdued, and Alexander was pronounced out of danger, to the delight of the whole army[1]. A reasonable time sufficed, to restore him to his former health and vigour.

Operations of Alexander in Kilikia.

It was his first operation, after recovery, to send forward Parmenio, at the head of the Greeks, Thessalians, and Thracians, in his army, for the purpose of clearing the forward route and of securing the pass called the Gates of Kilikia and Syria[2]. This narrow road, bounded by the range of Mount Amanus on the east and by the sea on the west, had been once barred by a double cross-wall with gates for passage, marking the original boundaries of Kilikia and Syria. The Gates, about six days' march beyond Tarsus[3], were found guarded, but the guard fled with little resistance. At the same time, Alexander himself, conducting the Macedonian troops in a south-westerly direction from Tarsus, employed some time in mastering and regulating the towns of Anchialus and Soli, as well as the Kilikian mountaineers. Then, returning to Tarsus, and recommencing his

[1] This interesting anecdote is recounted, with more or less of rhetoric and amplification, in all the historians—Arrian, ii. 4; Diodor. xvii. 31; Plutarch, Alexand. 19; Curtius, iii. 5; Justin, xi. 8.

It is one mark of the difference produced in the character of Alexander, by superhuman successes continued for four years—to contrast the generous confidence which he here displayed towards Philippus, with his cruel prejudgement and torture of Philôtas four years afterwards.

[2] Arrian, ii. 5, 1; Diodor. xvii. 32; Curtius, iii. 7, 6.

[3] Cyrus the younger was five days in marching from Tarsus to Issus, and one day more from Issus to the Gates of Kilikia and Syria.—Xenoph. Anab. i. 4, 1; Vol. IX. Ch. lxix. p. 35 of this History.

forward march, he advanced with the infantry and with his chosen squadron of cavalry, first to Magarsus near the mouth of the river Pyramus, next to Mallus; the general body of cavalry, under Philôtus, being sent by a more direct route across the Aleïan plain. Mallus, sacred to the prophet Amphilochus as patron-hero, was said to be a colony from Argos; on both these grounds Alexander was disposed to treat it with peculiar respect. He offered solemn sacrifice to Amphilochus, exempted Mallus from tribute, and appeased some troublesome discord among the citizens[1].

B.C. 333. March of Alexander out of Kilikia, through Issus, to Myriandrus.

It was at Mallus that he received his first distinct communication respecting Darius and the main Persian army; which was said to be encamped at Sochi in Syria, on the eastern side of Mount Amanus, about two days' march from the mountain pass now called Beylan. That pass, traversing the Amanian range, forms the continuance of the main road from Asia Minor into Syria, after having passed first over Taurus, and next through the difficult point of ground above specified (called the Gates of Kilikia and Syria), between Mount Amanus and the sea. Assembling his principal officers, Alexander communicated to them the position of Darius, now encamped in a spacious plain with prodigious superiority of numbers, especially of cavalry. Though the locality was thus rather favourable to the enemy, yet the Macedonians, full of hopes and courage, called upon Alexander to lead them forthwith against him. Accordingly Alexander, well-pleased with their alacrity, began his forward march

[1] Arrian, ii. 5, 11.

on the following morning. He passed through Issus, where he left some sick and wounded under a moderate guard—then through the Gates of Kilikia and Syria. At the second day's march from those Gates, he reached the seaport Myriandrus, the first town of Syria or Phenicia[1].

Here, having been detained in his camp one day by a dreadful storm, he received intelligence which altogether changed his plans. The Persian army had been marched away from Sochi, and was now in Kilikia, following in his rear. It had already got possession of Issus.

March of Darius from the interior to the eastern side of Mount Amanus. Immense numbers of his army: great wealth and ostentation in it: the treasure and baggage is sent to Damascus.

Darius had marched out of the interior his vast and miscellaneous host, stated at 600,000 men. His mother, his wife, his harem, his children, his personal attendants of every description, accompanied him, to witness what was anticipated as a certain triumph. All the apparatus of ostentation and luxury was provided in abundance, for the king and for his Persian grandees. The baggage was enormous: of gold and silver alone, we are told that there was enough to furnish load for 600 mules and 300 camels[2]. A temporary bridge being thrown over the Euphrates, five days were required to enable the whole army to cross[3]. Much of the treasure and baggage, however, was not allowed to follow the army to the vicinity of Mount Amanus, but was sent under a guard to Damascus in Syria.

B.C. 333.

At the head of such an overwhelming host, Darius was eager to bring on at once a general battle. It was not sufficient for him simply to keep back an enemy,

[1] Arrian, ii. 6.
[2] Curtius, iii. 3, 24.
[3] Curtius, iii. 7, 1.

Position of Darius on the plain eastward of Mount Amanus. He throws open the mountain passes, to let Alexander come through, and fight a pitched battle.

whom, when once in presence, he calculated on crushing altogether. Accordingly, he had given no orders (as we have just seen) to defend the line of the Taurus; he had admitted Alexander unopposed into Kilikia, and he intended to let him enter in like manner through the remaining strong passes—first, the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, between Mount Amanus and the sea—next, the pass now called Beylan, across Amanus itself. He both expected and wished that his enemy should come into the plain to fight, there to be trodden down by the countless horsemen of Persia.

Impatience of Darius at the delay of Alexander in Kilikia. He crosses Mount Amanus to attack Alexander in the defiles of Kilikia.

But such anticipation was not at once realized. The movements of Alexander, hitherto so rapid and unremitting, seemed suspended. We have already noticed the dangerous fever which threatened his life, occasioning not only a long halt, but much uneasiness among the Macedonian army. All was doubtless reported to the Persians, with abundant exaggerations: and when Alexander, immediately after recovery, instead of marching forward towards them, turned away from them to subdue the western portion of Kilikia, this again was construed by Darius as an evidence of hesitation and fear. It is even asserted that Parmenio wished to await the attack of the Persians in Kilikia, and that Alexander at first consented to do so[1]. At any rate, Darius, after a certain interval, contracted the persuasion, and was assured by his Asiatic councillors and courtiers, that the Macedonians, though audacious and triumphant against frontier satraps, now hung back intimidated by the approaching majesty

[1] Curtius, iii. 7, 8.

and full muster of the empire, and that they would not stand to resist his attack. Under this impression Darius resolved upon an advance into Kilikia with all his army. Thymôdes indeed, and other intelligent Grecian advisers—together with the Macedonian exile Amyntas—deprecated his new resolution, entreating him to persevere in his original purpose: They pledged themselves that Alexander would come forth to attack him wherever he was, and that too, speedily. They dwelt on the imprudence of fighting in the narrow defiles of Kilikia, where his numbers, and especially his vast cavalry, would be useless. Their advice, however, was not only disregarded by Darius, but denounced by the Persian councillors as traitorous[1]. Even some of the Greeks in the camp shared, and transmitted in their letters to Athens, the blind confidence of the monarch. The order was forthwith given for the whole army to quit the plains of Syria and march across Mount Amanus into Kilikia[2]. To cross, by any pass, over such a range as that of Mount Amanus, with a numerous army, heavy baggage, and ostentatious train (including all the suite necessary for the regal family), must have been a work of no inconsiderable time; and the only two passes over this mountain were, both of

[1] From Æschines (cont. Ktesiphont. p. 552) it seems that Demosthenes, and the anti-Macedonian statesmen at Athens, received letters at this moment written in high spirits, intimating that Alexander was "caught and pinned up" in Kilikia. Demosthenes (if we may believe Æschines) went about showing these letters, and boasting of the good news which was at hand. Josephus (Ant. Jud. xi. 8, 3) also reports the confident anticipations of Persian success, entertained by Sanballat at Samaria, as well as by all the Asiatics around.

[2] Arrian, ii. 6; Curtius, iii. 8, 2; Diodor. xvii. 32.

them, narrow and easily defensible[1]. Darius followed the northernmost of the two, which brought him into the rear of his enemy.

He arrives in Alexander's rear, and captures Issus.

Thus at the same time that the Macedonians were marching southward to cross Mount Amanus by the southern pass, and attack Darius in the plain—Darius was coming over into Kilikia by the northern pass to drive them before him back into Macedonia[2]. Reaching Issus, seemingly about two days after they had left it, he became master of their sick and wounded left in the town. With odious brutality, his grandees impelled him to inflict upon these poor men either death or amputation of hands and arms[3]. He then marched forward—along the same road by the shore of the Gulf which had already been followed by Alexander—and encamped on the banks of the river Pinarus.

Return of Alexander from Myriandrus: his address to his army.

The fugitives from Issus hastened to inform Alexander, whom they overtook at Myriandrus. So astonished was he, that he refused to believe the

[1] Cicero, Epist. ad Famil. xv. 4. See the instructive commentary of Mützell ad Curtium, iii. 8. p. 103, 104. I have given in an Appendix to this Volume, a Plan of the ground near Issus, together with some explanatory comments.

[2] Plutarch (Alexand. 20) states this general fact correctly; but he is mistaken in saying that the two armies missed one another in the night, &c.

[3] Arrian, ii. 7, 2; Curtius, iii. 8, 14. I have mentioned, a few pages back, that about a fortnight before, Alexander had sent Parmenio forward from Tarsus to secure the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, while he himself marched backward to Soli and Anchialus. He and Parmenio must have been separated at this time by a distance, not less than eight days of ordinary march. If during this interval, Darius had arrived at Issus, he would have been just between them, and would have cut them off one from the other. It was Alexander's good luck that so grave an embarrassment did not occur.

news, until it had been confirmed by some officers whom he sent northward along the coast of the Gulf in a small galley, and to whom the vast Persian multitude on the shore was distinctly visible. Then, assembling the chief officers, he communicated to them the near approach of the enemy, expatiating on the favourable auspices under which a battle would now take place[1]. His address was hailed with acclamation by his hearers, who demanded only to be led against the enemy[2].

Position of the Macedonian army south of the river Pinarus.

His distance from the Persian position may have been about eighteen miles[3]. By an evening march, after supper, he reached at midnight the narrow defile (between Mount Amanus and the sea) called the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, through which he had marched two days before. Again master of that important position, he rested there the last portion of the night, and advanced forward at daybreak northward towards Darius. At first the breadth of practicable road was so confined, as to admit only a narrow column of march, with the cavalry following the infantry; presently it widened, enabling Alexander to enlarge his front by bringing up successively the divisions of the phalanx. On approaching near to the river Pinarus (which flowed across the pass), he adopted

[1] Arrian, ii. 7, 8.

[2] Arrian, ii. 7; Curtius, iii. 10; Diodor. xvii. 33.

[3] Kallisthenes called the distance 100 stadia (ap. Polyb. xii. 19). This seems likely to be under the truth.

Polybius criticises severely the description given by Kallisthenes of the march of Alexander. Not having before us the words of Kallisthenes himself, we are hardly in a condition to appreciate the goodness of the criticism; which in some points is certainly overstrained.

his order of battle. On the extreme right he placed the hypaspists, or light division of hoplites; next (reckoning from right to left), five Taxeis or divisions of the phalanx, under Kœnus, Perdikkas, Meleager, Ptolemy, and Amyntas. Of these three last or left divisions, Kraterus had the general command; himself subject to the orders of Parmenio, who commanded the entire left half of the army. The breadth of plain between the mountains on the right, and the sea on the left, is said to have been not more than fourteen stadia, or about one English mile and a half[1]. From fear of being outflanked by the superior numbers of the Persians, he gave strict orders to Parmenio to keep close to the sea. His Macedonian cavalry, the Companions, together with the Thessalians, were placed on his right flank; as were also the Agrianes, and the principal portion of the light infantry. The Peloponnesian and allied cavalry, with the Thracian and Kretan light infantry, were sent on the left flank to Parmenio[2].

Position of the Persian army north of the Pinarus.

Darius, informed that Alexander was approaching, resolved to fight where he was encamped, behind the river Pinarus. He, however, threw across the river a force of 30,000 cavalry, and 20,000 infantry, to ensure the undisturbed formation of his main force behind the river[3]. He composed his phalanx or main line of battle, of 90,000 hoplites; 30,000 Greek hoplites in the centre, and 30,000

[1] Kallisthenes ap. Polybium, xii. 17. [2] Arrian, ii. 8, 4–13.

[3] Compare Kallisthenes ap. Polyb. xii. 17; and Arrian, ii. 8, 8. Considering how narrow the space was, such numerous bodies as these 30,000 horse and 20,000 foot must have found little facility in moving. Kallisthenes did not notice them, as far as we can collect from Polybius.

Asiatics armed as hoplites (called Kardakes), on each side of these Greeks. These men—not distributed into separate divisions, but grouped in one body or multitude[1]—filled the breadth between the mountains and the sea. On the mountains to his left, he placed a body of 20,000 men, intended to act against the right flank and rear of Alexander. But for the great numerical mass of his vast host, he could find no room to act; accordingly they remained useless in the rear of his Greek and Asiatic hoplites; yet not formed into any body of reserve, or kept disposable for assisting in case of need. When his line was thoroughly formed, he recalled to the left bank of the Pinarus the 30,000 cavalry and 20,000 infantry which he had sent across as a protecting force. A part of this cavalry were sent to his extreme left wing, but the mountain ground

[1] Arrian, ii. 8, 9. Τοσούτους γὰρ ἐπὶ φάλαγγος ἁπλῆς ἐδέχετο τὸ χώριον, ἵνα ἐτάσσοντο.

The depth of this single phalanx is not given, nor do we know the exact width of the ground which it occupied. Assuming a depth of sixteen, and one pace in breadth to each soldier, 4000 men would stand in the breadth of a stadium of 250 paces; and therefore 80,000 men in a breadth of twenty stadia (see the calculation of Rüstow and Köchly (p. 280) about the Macedonian line). Assuming a depth of twenty-six, 6500 men would stand in the breadth of the stadium, and therefore 90,000 in a total breadth of 14 stadia, which is that given by Kallisthenes. But there must have been intervals left, greater or less, we know not how many; the covering detachments, which had been thrown out before the river Pinarus, must have found some means of passing through to the rear, when recalled.

Mr. Kinneir states that the breadth between Mount Amanus and the sea varies between one mile and a half (English) and three miles. The fourteen stadia of Kallisthenes are equivalent to nearly one English mile and three-quarters.

Neither in ancient nor in modern times have Oriental armies ever been trained, by native officers, to regularity of march or array—see Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, ch. xxiii. vol. ii. p. 498; Volney, Travels in Egypt and Syria, vol. i. p. 124.

was found unsuitable for them to act, so that they were forced to cross the right wing, where accordingly the great mass of the Persian cavalry became assembled. Darius himself in his chariot was in the centre of the line, behind the Grecian hoplites. In the front of his whole line ran the river or rivulet Pinarus; the banks of which, in many parts naturally steep, he obstructed in some places by embankments[1].

Battle of Issus.

As soon as Alexander, by the retirement of the Persian covering detachment, was enabled to perceive the final dispositions of Darius, he made some alteration in his own, transferring his Thessalian cavalry by a rear movement from his right to his left wing, and bringing forward the lancer-cavalry or sarissophori, as well as the light infantry, Pæonians, and archers, to the front of his right. The Agrianians, together with some cavalry and another body of archers, were detached from the general line to form an oblique front against the 20,000 Persians posted on the hill to outflank him. As these 20,000 men came near enough to threaten his flank, Alexander directed the Agrianians to attack them, and to drive them farther away on the hills. They manifested so little firmness, and gave way so easily, that he felt no dread of any serious aggressive movement from them. He therefore contented himself with holding back in reserve against them

[1] Arrian, ii. 10, 2. Kallisthenes appears to have reckoned the mercenaries composing the Persian phalanx at 30,000—and the cavalry at 30,000. He does not seem to have taken account of the Kardakes. Yet Polybius in his criticism tries to make out that there was not room for an array of even 60,000; while Arrian enumerates 90,000 hoplites, not including cavalry (Polyb. xii. 18).

a body of 300 heavy cavalry; while he placed the Agrianians and the rest on the right of his main line, in order to make his front equal to that of his enemies[1].

Having thus formed his array, after giving the troops a certain halt after their march, he advanced at a very slow pace, anxious to maintain his own front even, and anticipating that the enemy might cross the Pinarus to meet him. But as they did not move, he continued his advance, preserving the uniformity of the front, until he arrived within bowshot, when he himself, at the head of his cavalry, hypaspists, and divisions of the phalanx on the right, accelerated his pace, crossed the river at a quick step, and fell upon the Kardakes or Asiatic hoplites on the Persian left. Unprepared for the suddenness and vehemence of this attack, these Kardakes scarcely resisted a moment, but gave way as soon as they came to close quarters, and fled, vigorously pressed by the Macedonian right. Darius, who was in his chariot in the centre, perceived that this untoward desertion exposed his person from the left flank. Seized with panic, he caused his chariot to be turned round, and fled with all speed among the foremost fugitives[2]. He kept to

[1] Arrian, ii. 9; Kallisthenes ap. Polyb. xii. 17. The slackness of this Persian corps on the flank, and the ease with which Alexander drove them back—a material point in reference to the battle—are noticed also by Curtius, iii. 9, 11.

[2] Arrian, ii. 11, 6. *εὐθὺς, ὡς εἶχεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος, σὺν τοῖς πρώτοις ἔφευγε*, &c.

This simple statement of Arrian is far more credible than the highly wrought details given by Diodorus (xvii. 34) and Curtius (iii. 11, 9) about a direct charge of Alexander upon the chariot of Darius, and a murderous combat immediately round that chariot, in which the horses

his chariot as long as the ground permitted, but quitted it on reaching some rugged ravines, and mounted on horseback to make sure of escape; in such terror, that he cast away his bow, his shield, and his regal mantle. He does not seem to have given a single order, nor to have made the smallest effort to repair a first misfortune. The flight of the king was the signal for all who observed it to flee also; so that the vast host in the rear were quickly to be seen trampling one another down, in their efforts to get through the difficult ground out of the reach of the enemy. Darius was himself not merely the centre of union for all the miscellaneous contingents composing the army, but also the sole commander; so that after his flight there was no one left to give any general order.

became wounded and unmanageable, so as to be on the point of overturning it. Chares even went so far as to affirm that Alexander had come into personal conflict with Darius, from whom he had received his wound in the thigh (Plutarch, Alex. 20). Plutarch had seen the letter addressed by Alexander to Antipater, simply intimating that he had received a slight wound in the thigh.

In respect to this point, as to so many others, Diodorus and Curtius have copied the same authority.

Kallisthenes (ap. Polyb. xii. 22) stated that Alexander had laid his plan of attack with a view to bear upon the person of Darius, which is not improbable (compare Xenoph. Anab. i. 8, 22), and was in fact realized, since the first successful charge of the Macedonians came so near to Darius as to alarm him for the safety of his own person. To the question put by Polybius—How did Alexander know in what part of the army Darius was?—we may reply, that the chariot and person of Darius would doubtless be conspicuous: moreover, the Persian kings were habitually in the centre—and Cyrus the younger, at the battle of Kunaxa, directed the attack to be made exactly against the person of his brother Artaxerxes.

After the battle of Kunaxa, Artaxerxes assumed to himself the honour of having slain Cyrus with his own hand, and put to death those who had really done the deed, because they boasted of it (Plutarch, Artax. 16).

This great battle—we ought rather to say, that which ought to have been a great battle—was thus lost,—through the giving way of the Asiatic hoplites on the Persian left, and the immediate flight of Darius,—within a few minutes after its commencement. But the centre and right of the Persians, not yet apprised of these misfortunes, behaved with gallantry. When Alexander made his rapid dash forward with the right, under his own immediate command, the phalanx in his left centre (which was under Kraterus and Parmenio) either did not receive the same accelerating order, or found itself both retarded and disordered by greater steepness in the banks of the Pinarus. Here it was charged by the Grecian mercenaries, the best troops in the Persian service. The combat which took place was obstinate, and the Macedonian loss not inconsiderable; the general of division, Ptolemy son of Seleukus, with 120 of the front rank men or choice phalangites, being slain. But presently Alexander, having completed the rout on the enemies' left, brought back his victorious troops from the pursuit, attacked the Grecian mercenaries in flank, and gave decisive superiority to their enemies. These Grecian mercenaries were beaten and forced to retire. On finding that Darius himself had fled, they got away from the field as well as they could, yet seemingly in good order. There is even reason to suppose that a part of them forced their way up the mountains or through the Macedonian line, and made their escape southward[1].

Alarm and immediate flight of Darius—defeat of the Persians.

[1] This is the supposition of Mr. Williams, and it appears to me probable, though Mr. Ainsworth calls it in question, in consequence of the

Meanwhile on the Persian right, towards the sea, the heavy-armed Persian cavalry had shown much bravery. They were bold enough to cross the Pinarus[1] and vigorously to charge the Thessalians; with whom they maintained a close contest, until the news spread that Darius had disappeared, and that the left of the army was routed. They then turned their backs and fled, sustaining terrible damage from their enemies in the retreat. Of the Kardakes on the *right* flank of the Grecian hoplites in the Persian line, we hear nothing, nor of the Macedonian infantry opposed to them. Perhaps these Kardakes came little into action, since the cavalry on their part of the field were so severely engaged. At any rate they took part in the general flight of the Persians, as soon as Darius was known to have left the field[2].

Vigorous and destructive pursuit by Alexander —capture of the mother and wife of Darius.

The rout of the Persians being completed, Alexander began a vigorous pursuit. The destruction and slaughter of the fugitives was prodigious. Amidst so small a breadth of practicable ground, narrowed sometimes into a defile and broken by frequent watercourses, their vast numbers found

difficulties of the ground southward of Myriandrus towards the sea. [See Mr. Ainsworth's Essay on the Cilician and Syrian Gates, Journal of the Geograph. Society, 1838, p. 194.] These Greeks, being merely fugitives with arms in their hands—with neither cavalry nor baggage—could make their way over very difficult ground.

[1] Arrian, ii. 11, 3; Curtius, iii. 11, 13. Kallisthenes stated the same thing as Arrian—that this Persian cavalry had crossed the Pinarus, and charged the Thessalians with bravery. Polybius censures him for it, as if he had affirmed something false and absurd (xii. 18). This shows that the criticisms of Polybius are not to be accepted without reserve. He reasons as if the Macedonian phalanx *could* not cross the Pinarus—converting a difficulty into an impossibility (xii. 22).

[2] Arrian, ii. 11; Curtius, iii. 11.

no room, and trod one another down. As many perished in this way as by the sword of the conquerors; insomuch that Ptolemy (afterwards king of Egypt, the companion and historian of Alexander) recounts that he himself in the pursuit came to a ravine choked up with dead bodies, of which he made a bridge to pass over it[1]. The pursuit was continued as long as the light of a November day allowed; but the battle had not begun till a late hour. The camp of Darius was taken, together with his mother, his wife, his sister, his infant son, and two daughters. His chariot, his shield, and his bow also fell into the power of the conquerors; and a sum of 3000 talents in money was found, though much of the treasure had been sent to Damascus. The total loss of the Persians is said to have amounted to 10,000 horse and 100,000 foot; among the slain moreover were several eminent Persian grandees,—Arsames, Rheomithres, and Atizyes, who had commanded at the Granikus—Sabakes, satrap of Egypt. Of the Macedonians we are told that 300 foot and 150 horse were killed. Alexander himself was slightly wounded in the thigh by a sword[2].

Courteous treatment of the regal female prisoners by Alexander.

The mother, wife, and family of Darius, who became captives, were treated by Alexander's order with the utmost consideration and respect. When Alexander returned at night from the pursuit, he found the Persian regal tent reserved and prepared

[1] Arrian, ii. 11, 11; Kallisthenes ap. Polyb. xii. 20.

[2] Arrian, ii. 11; Diodor. xvii. 36. Curtius (iii. 11, 27) says that the Macedonians lost thirty-two foot and one hundred and fifty horse, killed; with 504 men wounded;—Justin states, 130 foot, and 150 horse (xi. 9).

for him. In an inner compartment of it he heard the tears and wailings of women. He was informed that the mourners were the mother and wife of Darius, who had learnt that the bow and shield of Darius had been taken, and were giving loose to their grief under the belief that Darius himself was killed. Alexander immediately sent Leonnâtus to assure them that Darius was still living, and to promise further that they should be allowed to preserve the regal title and state—his war against Darius being undertaken not from any feelings of hatred, but as a fair contest for the empire of Asia[1]. Besides this anecdote, which depends on good authority, many others, uncertified or untrue, were recounted about his kind behaviour to these princesses; and Alexander himself, shortly after the battle, seems to have heard fictions about it, which he thought himself obliged to contradict in a letter. It is certain (from the extract now remaining of this letter) that he never saw, nor ever entertained the idea of seeing, the captive wife of Darius, said to be the most beautiful woman in Asia; moreover he even declined to hear encomiums upon her beauty[2].

Complete dispersion of the Persian army—Darius recrosses the Euphrates—escape of some Perso-Grecian mercenaries.

How this vast host of fugitives got out of the narrow limits of Kilikia, or how many of them quitted that country by the same pass over Mount Amanus as that by which they had entered it—we cannot make out. It is probable that many, and

[1] Arrian, ii. 12, 8—from Ptolemy and Aristobulus. Compare Diodor. xvii. 36; Curtius, iii. 11, 24; iii. 12, 17.

[2] Plutarch, Alex. 22. ἐγὼ γὰρ (Alexander) οὐχ ὅτι ἑωρακὼς ἂν εὐρεθείην τὴν Δαρείου γυναῖκα ἢ βεβουλευμένος ἰδεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν λεφόντων περὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας αὐτῆς προσδεδεγμένος τὸν λόγον.

Darius himself among the number, made their escape across the mountain by various subordinate roads and by-paths; which, though unfit for a regular army with baggage, would be found a welcome resource by scattered companies. Darius managed to get together 4000 of the fugitives, with whom he hastened to Thapsakus, and there recrossed the Euphrates. The only remnant of force, still in a position of defence after the battle, consisted of 8000 of the Grecian mercenaries under Amyntas and Thymôdes. These men, fighting their way out of Kilikia (seemingly towards the south, by or near Myriandrus), marched to Tripolis on the coast of Phenicia, where they still found the same vessels in which they had themselves been brought from the armament of Lesbos. Seizing sufficient means of transport, and destroying the rest to prevent pursuit, they immediately crossed over to Cyprus, and from thence to Egypt[1]. With this single exception, the enormous Persian host disappears with the battle of Issus. We hear of no attempt to rally or re-form, nor of any fresh Persian force afoot until two years afterwards. The booty acquired by the victors was immense, not merely in gold and silver, but also in captives for the slave-merchant. On the morrow of the battle, Alexander offered a solemn sacrifice of thanksgiving, with three altars erected on the banks of the Pinarus; while he at the same time buried the dead, consoled

[1] Arrian, ii. 13, 2, 3; Diodor. xvii. 48. Curtius says that these Greeks got away by by-paths across the mountains (Amanus)—which may be true (Curtius, iii. 11, 19).

the wounded, and rewarded or complimented all who had distinguished themselves[1].

Prodigious effect produced by the victory of Issus.

No victory recorded in history was ever more complete in itself, or more far-stretching in its consequences, than that of Issus. Not only was the Persian force destroyed or dispersed, but the efforts of Darius for recovery were paralysed by the capture of his family. Portions of the dissipated army of Issus may be traced, re-appearing in different places for operations of detail, but we shall find no farther resistance to Alexander and his main force, except from the brave freemen of two fortified cities. Everywhere an overwhelming sentiment of admiration and terror was spread abroad, towards the force, skill, or good fortune of Alexander, by whichever name it might be called—together with contempt for the real value of a Persian army, in spite of so much imposing pomp and numerical show; a contempt, not new to intelligent Greeks, but now communicated even to vulgar minds by the recent unparalleled catastrophe. Both as general and as soldier, indeed, the consummate excellence of Alexander stood conspicuous, not less than the signal deficiency of Darius. The fault in the latter, upon which most remark is usually made, was, that of fighting the battle, not in an open plain, but in a narrow valley, whereby his superiority of number was rendered unprofitable. But this (as I have

[1] Arrian, ii. 12, 1; Curtius, iii. 12, 27; Diodor. xvii. 40. The "Aræ Alexandri, in radicibus Amani," are mentioned by Cicero (ad Famil. xv. 4). When commanding in Kilikia, he encamped there with his army four days.

already observed) was only one among many mistakes, and by no means the most serious. The result would have been the same, had the battle been fought in the plains to the eastward of Mount Amanus. Superior numbers are of little avail on any ground unless there be a general who knows how to make use of them; unless they be distributed into separate divisions ready to combine for offensive action on many points at once, or at any rate to lend support to each other in defence, so that a defeat of one fraction is not a defeat of the whole. The faith of Darius in simple multitude was altogether blind and childish[1]; nay, that faith, though overweening beforehand, disappeared at once when he found his enemies did not run away, but faced him boldly—as was seen by his attitude on the banks of the Pinarus, where he stood to be attacked instead of executing his threat of treading down the handful opposed to him[2]. But it was not merely as a general, that Darius acted in such a manner as to render the loss of the battle certain. Had his dispositions been ever so skilful, his personal cowardice, in quitting the field and thinking only of his own safety, would have sufficed to nullify their effect[3]. Though the Persian grandees are

[1] See this faith put forward in the speech of Xerxes—Herodot. vii. 48: compare the speech of Achæmenes, vii. 236.

[2] Arrian, ii. 10, 2. καὶ ταύτῃ ὡς δῆλος ἐγένετο (Darius) τοῖς ἀμφ' Ἀλέξανδρον τῇ γνώμῃ δεδουλωμένος (a remarkable expression borrowed from Thucydides, iv. 34). Compare Arrian, ii. 6, 7.

[3] Immediately before the battle of Kunaxa, Cyrus the younger was asked by some of the Grecian officers, whether he thought that his brother Artaxerxes (who had as yet made no resistance) would fight—"To be sure he will (was the reply); if he is the son of Darius and Parysatis, and my brother, I shall not obtain the crown without fight-

generally conspicuous for personal courage, yet we shall find Darius hereafter again exhibiting the like melancholy timidity, and the like incompetence for using numbers with effect, at the battle of Arbela, though fought in a spacious plain chosen by himself.

B.C. 333, autumn. Effects produced in Greece by the battle of Issus. Anti-Macedonian projects crushed.

Happy was it for Memnon, that he did not live to see the renunciation of his schemes, and the ruin consequent upon it! The fleet in the Ægean, which had been transferred at his death to Pharnabazus, though weakened by the loss of those mercenaries whom Darius had recalled to Issus, and disheartened by a serious defeat which the Persian Orontobates had received from the Macedonians in Karia[1], was nevertheless not inactive in trying to organize an anti-Macedonian manifestation in Greece. While Pharnabazus was at the island of Siphnos with his 100 triremes, he was visited by the Lacedæmonian king Agis, who pressed him to embark for Peloponnesus as large a force as he could spare, to second a movement projected by the Spartans. But such aggressive plans were at once crushed by the terror-striking news of the battle of Issus. Apprehending a revolt in the island of Chios, as the result of this news, Pharnabazus immediately sailed thither with a large detachment. Agis, obtaining nothing more than a subsidy of thirty talents and a squadron of ten triremes, was obliged to renounce his projects in Peloponnesus, and to content himself with directing some operations in Krete, to be conducted by his brother

ing!" Personal cowardice, in a king of Persia at the head of his army, seemed inconceivable (Xenoph. Anab. i. 7, 9). [1] Arrian, ii. 5, 8.

Agesilaus; while he himself remained among the islands; and ultimately accompanied the Persian Autophradates to Halikarnassus[1]. It appears, however, that he afterwards went to conduct the operations in Krete, and that he had considerable success in that island, bringing several Kretan towns to join the Persians[2]. On the whole, however, the victory of Issus overawed all free spirit throughout Greece, and formed a guarantee to Alexander for at least a temporary quiescence. The philo-Macedonian synod, assembled at Corinth during the period of the Isthmian festival, manifested their joy by sending to him an embassy of congratulation and a wreath of gold[3].

B.C. 333, winter. Capture of Damascus by the Macedonians, with Persian treasure and prisoners.

With little delay after his victory, Alexander marched through Kœle-Syria to the Phenician coast, detaching Parmenio in his way to attack Damascus, whither Darius, before the battle, had sent most part of his treasure with many confidential officers, Persian women of rank, and envoys. Though the place might have held out a considerable siege, it was surrendered without resistance by the treason or cowardice of the governor; who made a feint of trying to convey away the treasure, but took care that it should fall into the hands of the enemy[4]. There was captured

[1] Arrian, ii. 13, 4–8. [2] Diodor. xvii. 48.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 48; Curtius, iv. 5, 11. Curtius seems to mention this vote later, but it must evidently have been passed at the first Isthmian festival after the battle of Issus.

[4] Arrian, ii. 11, 13; Curtius, iii. 13. The words of Arrian (ii. 15, 1)—ὀπίσω κομίσαντα ἐς Δαμασκὸν—confirm the statement of Curtius, that this treasure was captured by Parmenio, not in the town, but in the hands of fugitives who were conveying it away from the town.

a large treasure—with a prodigious number and variety of attendants and ministers of luxury, belonging to the court and the grandees[1]. Moreover the prisoners made were so numerous, that most of the great Persian families had to deplore the loss of some relative, male or female. There were among them the widow and daughters of king Ochus, the predecessor of Darius—the daughter of Darius's brother Oxathres—the wives of Artabazus, and of Pharnabazus—the three daughters of Mentor, and Barsinê, widow of the deceased Memnon with her child, sent up by Memnon to serve as an hostage for his fidelity. There were also several eminent Grecian exiles, Theban, Lacedæmonian and Athenian, who had fled to Darius, and whom he had thought fit to send to Damascus, instead of allowing them to use their pikes with the army at Issus. The Theban and Athenian exiles were at once released by Alexander; the Lacedæmonians were for the time put under arrest, but not detained long. Among the Athenian exiles was a person of noble name and parentage—Iphikrates, son of the great Athenian officer of that name[2]. The captive Iphikrates not only received his liberty, but was induced by courteous and honourable treatment to remain with Alexander. He died however shortly afterwards from sickness, and his ashes were then collected, by

[1] A fragment of the letter from Parmenio to Alexander is preserved, giving a detailed list of the articles of booty (Athenæus, xiii. p. 607).

[2] Arrian, ii. 15, 5; Curtius, iii. 13, 13–16. There is some discrepancy between the two (compare Arrian, iii. 24, 7) as to the names of the Lacedæmonian envoys.

order of Alexander, to be sent to his family at Athens.

I have already stated in a former volume[1] that the elder Iphikrates had been adopted by Alexander's grandfather into the regal family of Macedonia, as the saviour of their throne: probably this was the circumstance which determined the superior favour shown to the son, rather than any sentiment either towards Athens or towards the military genius of the father. The difference of position, between Iphikrates the father and Iphikrates the son, is one among the painful evidences of the downward march of Hellenism: the father, a distinguished officer moving amidst a circle of freemen, sustaining by arms the security and dignity of his own fellow-citizens, and even interfering for the rescue of the Macedonian regal family; the son, condemned to witness the degradation of his native city by Macedonian arms, and deprived of all other means of reviving or rescuing her, except such as could be found in the service of an Oriental prince, whose stupidity and cowardice threw away at once his own security and the freedom of Greece.

Capture and treatment of the Athenian Iphikrates. Altered relative position of Greeks and Macedonians.

Master of Damascus and of Kœle-Syria, Alexander advanced onward to Phenicia. The first Phenician town which he approached was Marathus, on the mainland opposite the islet of Aradus, forming, along with that islet and some other neighbouring towns, the domain of the Aradian prince Gerostratus.

B.C. 333–332, winter. Alexander in Phenicia. Aradus, Byblus, and Sidon open their gates to him.

[1] See above, in this History, Vol. IX. Ch. lxxvii. p. 146; Vol. X. Ch. lxxix. p. 343; and Æschines, Fals. Leg. p. 263. c. 13.

Alexander himself had consented to be adopted by Ada princess of Karia as her son (Arrian, i. 23, 12).

That prince was himself now serving with his naval contingent among the Persian fleet in the Ægean; but his son Strato, acting as viceroy at home, despatched to Alexander his homage with a golden wreath, and made over to him at once Aradus with the neighbouring towns included in its domain. The example of Strato was followed, first by the inhabitants of Byblus, the next Phenician city in a southerly direction; next, by the great city of Sidon, the queen and parent of all Phenician prosperity. The Sidonians even sent envoys to meet him and invite his approach[1]. Their sentiments were unfavourable to the Persians, from remembrance of the bloody and perfidious proceedings which (about eighteen years before) had marked the recapture of their city by the armies of Ochus[2]. Nevertheless, the naval contingents both of Byblus and of Sidon (as well as that of Aradus), were at this moment sailing in the Ægean with the Persian admiral Autophradates, and formed a large proportion of his entire fleet[3].

Letter of Darius soliciting peace and the restitution of the regal captives. Haughty reply of Alexander.

While Alexander was still at Marathus, however, previous to his onward march, he received both envoys and a letter from Darius, asking for the restitution of his mother, wife, and children—and tendering friendship and alliance, as from one king to another. Darius farther attempted to show, that the Macedonian Philip had begun the wrong against Persia,—that Alexander had continued it—and that he himself (Darius) had acted merely in self-defence. In reply, Alexander wrote a letter, wherein he set

[1] Arrian, ii. 14, 11; ii. 15, 8.
[2] Diodor. xvi. 45.
[3] Arrian, ii. 15, 8; ii. 20, 1. Curtius, iv. 1, 6-16.

forth his own case against Darius, proclaiming himself the appointed leader of the Greeks, to avenge the ancient invasion of Greece by Xerxes. He then alleged various complaints against Darius, whom he accused of having instigated the assassination of Philip as well as the hostilities of the anti-Macedonian cities in Greece. "Now (continued he), by the grace of the Gods, I have been victorious, first over your satraps, next over yourself. I have taken care of all who submit to me, and made them satisfied with their lot. Come yourself to me also, as to the master of all Asia. Come without fear of suffering harm; ask me, and you shall receive back your mother and wife, and any thing else which you please. When next you write to me, however, address me not as an equal, but as lord of Asia and of all that belongs to you; otherwise I shall deal with you as a wrong-doer. If you intend to contest the kingdom with me, stand and fight for it, and do not run away. I shall march forward against you, wherever you may be[1]."

This memorable correspondence, which led to no result, is of importance only as it marks the character of Alexander, with whom fighting and conquering were both the business and the luxury of life, and to whom all assumption of equality and independence with himself, even on the part of other kings—every thing short of submission and obedience—appeared in the light of wrong and insult

[1] Arrian, ii. 14; Curtius, iv. i. 10; Diodor. xvii. 39. I give the substance of this correspondence from Arrian. Both Curtius and Diodorus represent Darius as offering great sums of money and large cessions of territory, in exchange for the restitution of the captives. Arrian says nothing of the kind.

to be avenged. The recital of comparative injuries, on each side, was mere unmeaning pretence. The real and only question was (as Alexander himself had put it in his message to the captive Sisygambis[1]) which of the two should be master of Asia.

Importance of the voluntary surrender of the Phenician towns to Alexander.

The decision of this question, already sufficiently advanced on the morrow after the battle of Issus, was placed almost beyond doubt by the rapid and unopposed successes of Alexander among most of the Phenician cities. The last hopes of Persia now turned chiefly upon the sentiments of these Phenicians. The greater part of the Persian fleet in the Ægean was composed of Phenician triremes, partly from the coast of Syria, partly from the island of Cyprus. If the Phenician towns made submission to Alexander, it was certain that their ships and seamen would either return home spontaneously or be recalled; thus depriving the Persian quiver of its best remaining arrow. But if the Phenician towns held out resolutely against him, one and all, so as to put him under the necessity of besieging them in succession—each lending aid to the rest by sea, with superiority of naval force, and more than one of them being situated upon islets—the obstacles to be overcome would have been so multiplied, that even Alexander's energy and ability might hardly have proved sufficient for them: at any rate, he would have had hard work before him for perhaps two years, opening the door to many new accidents and efforts. It was therefore a signal good fortune to Alexander when the prince of the islet of Aradus spontaneously surrendered to him that difficult city,

[1] Arrian, ii. 12, 9.

and when the example was followed by the still greater city of Sidon. The Phenicians, taking them generally, had no positive tie to the Persians; neither had they much confederate attachment one towards the other, although as separate communities they were brave and enterprising. Among the Sidonians, there was even a prevalent feeling of aversion to the Persians, from the cause above mentioned. Hence the prince of Aradus, upon whom Alexander's march first came, had little certainty of aid from his neighbours, if he resolved to hold out; and still less disposition to hold out single-handed, after the battle of Issus had proclaimed the irresistible force of Alexander not less than the impotence of Persia. One after another, all these important Phenician seaports, except Tyre, fell into the hands of Alexander without striking a blow. At Sidon, the reigning prince Strato, reputed as philo-Persian, was deposed, and a person named Abdalonymus—of the reigning family, yet poor in circumstances—was appointed in his room[1].

Alexander appears before Tyre—readiness of the Tyrians to surrender, yet not without a point reserved—he determines to besiege the city.

With his usual rapidity, Alexander marched onward towards Tyre; the most powerful among the Phenician cities, though apparently less ancient than Sidon. Even on the march, he was met by a deputation from Tyre, composed of the most eminent men in the city, and headed by the son of the Tyrian prince Azemilchus, who was himself absent commanding the Tyrian contingent in the Persian fleet. These men brought large presents and supplies

[1] Curtius, iv. 1, 20–25; Justin, xi. 10. Diodorus (xvii. 47) tells the story as if it had occurred at Tyre, and not at Sidon; which is highly improbable.

for the Macedonian army, together with a golden wreath of honour; announcing formally that the Tyrians were prepared to do whatever Alexander commanded[1]. In reply, he commended the dispositions of the city, accepted the presents, and desired the deputation to communicate at home, that he wished to enter Tyre and offer sacrifice to Herakles. The Phenician God Melkart was supposed identical with the Grecian Herakles, and was thus ancestor of the Macedonian kings. His temple at Tyre was of the most venerable antiquity; moreover the injunction, to sacrifice there, is said to have been conveyed to Alexander in an oracle[2]. The Tyrians at home, after deliberating on this message, sent out an answer declining to comply, and intimating that they would not admit within their walls either Macedonians or Persians; but that as to all other points, they would obey Alexander's orders[3]. They added that his wish to sacrifice to Herakles might be accomplished without entering their city, since there was in Palætyrus (on the mainland over against the islet of Tyre, separated from it only by the narrow strait) a temple of that God yet more ancient and venerable than their own[4]. Incensed

[1] Arrian, ii. 15, 9. ὡς ἐγνωκότων Τυρίων πράσσειν, ὅ,τι ἂν ἐπαγγέλῃ Ἀλέξανδρος. Compare Curtius, iv. 2, 3.

[2] Curtius (*ut suprà*) adds these motives: Arrian inserts nothing beyond the simple request. The statement of Curtius represents what is likely to have been the real fact and the real feeling of Alexander.

It is certainly true that Curtius overloads his narrative with rhetorical and dramatic amplification; but it is not less true that Arrian falls into the opposite extreme—squeezing out *his* narrative until little is left beyond the dry skeleton.

[3] Arrian, ii. 16, 11.

[4] Curtius, iv. 2, 4; Justin, xi. 10. This item, both prudent and probable, in the reply of the Tyrians, is not noticed by Arrian.

at this qualified adhesion, in which he took note only of the point refused,—Alexander dismissed the envoys with angry menaces, and immediately resolved on taking Tyre by force[1].

Exorbitant dispositions and conduct of Alexander.

Those who (like Diodorus) treat such refusal on the part of the Tyrians as foolish wilfulness[2], have not fully considered how much the demand included. When Alexander made a solemn sacrifice to Artemis at Ephesus, he marched to her temple with his whole force armed and in battle array[3]. We cannot doubt that his sacrifice at Tyre to Herakles—his ancestral Hero, whose especial attribute was force—would have been celebrated with an array equally formidable, as in fact it was, after the town had been taken[4]. The Tyrians were thus required to admit within their walls an irresistible military force; which might indeed be withdrawn after the sacrifice was completed, but which might also remain, either wholly or in part, as permanent garrison of an almost impregnable position. They had not endured such treatment from Persia, nor were they disposed to endure it from a new master. It was in fact hazarding their all; submitting at once to a fate which might be as bad as could befall them after a successful siege. On the other hand, when we reflect that the Tyrians promised every thing short of submission to military occupation, we see that Alex-

[1] Arrian, ii. 16, 11. *τοὺς μὲν πρέσβεις πρὸς ὀργὴν ὀπίσω ἀπέπεμψεν*, &c. Curtius, iv. 2, 5. "Non tenuit iram, cujus alioqui potens non erat," &c.

[2] Diodorus, xvii. 40. *Οἱ δὲ Τύριοι, βουλομένου τοῦ βασιλέως τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ τῷ Τυρίῳ θῦσαι, προπετέστερον διεκώλυσαν αὐτὸν τῆς εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσόδου.*

[3] Arrian, i. 18, 4.

[4] Arrian, ii. 24, 10.

ander, had he been so inclined, could have obtained from them all that was really essential to his purpose, without the necessity of besieging the town. The great value of the Phenician cities consisted in their fleet, which now acted with the Persians, and gave to them the command of the sea[1]. Had Alexander required that this fleet should be withdrawn from the Persians and placed in his service, there can be no doubt that he would have obtained it readily. The Tyrians had no motive to devote themselves for Persia, nor did they probably (as Arrian supposes) attempt to trim between the two belligerents, as if the contest were still undecided[2]. Yet rather than hand over their city to the chances of a Macedonian soldiery, they resolved to brave the hazards of a siege. The pride of Alexander, impatient of opposition even to his most extreme demands, prompted him to take a step politically unprofitable, in order to make display of his power, by degrading and crushing, with or without a siege, one of the most ancient, spirited, wealthy and intelligent communities of the ancient world.

Tyre was situated on an islet nearly half a mile from the mainland[3]; the channel between the two

[1] This is the view expressed by Alexander himself, in his address to the army, inviting them to undertake the siege of Tyre (Arrian, ii. 17, 3–8).

[2] Arrian, ii. 16, 12. Curtius says (iv. 2, 2), "Tyros facilius *societatem* Alexandri acceptura videbatur, quam *imperium*." This is representing the pretensions of the Tyrians as greater than the fact warrants. They did not refuse the *imperium* of Alexander, though they declined compliance with one extreme demand.

Ptolemy I. (son of Lagus) afterwards made himself master of Jerusalem, by entering the town on the Sabbath, under pretence of offering sacrifice (Josephus, Antiq. Jud. xii. 1).

[3] Curtius, iv. 2, 7, 8. The site of Tyre at the present day presents

being shallow towards the land, but reaching a depth of eighteen feet in the part adjoining the city. The islet was completely surrounded by prodigious walls, the loftiest portion of which, on the side fronting the mainland, reached a height not less than 150 feet, with corresponding solidity and base[1]. Besides these external fortifications, there was a brave and numerous population within, aided by a good stock of arms, machines, ships, provisions, and other things essential to defence.

He prepares to besiege Tyre—situation of the place.

It was not without reason, therefore, that the Tyrians, when driven to their last resource, entertained hopes of holding out even against the formidable arm of Alexander; and against Alexander as he then stood, they might have held out successfully; for he had as yet no fleet, and they could defy any attack made simply from land. The question turned upon the Phenician and Cyprian ships, which were for the most part (the Tyrian among them) in the Ægean under the Persian admiral. Alexander—master as he was of Aradus, Byblus, Sidon, and all the Phenician cities except Tyre—calculated that the seamen belonging to these cities would follow their countrymen at home and bring away their ships to join him. He hoped also, as the victorious potentate, to draw to himself the willing adhesion of the Cyprian cities. This could hardly have failed to happen, if he had treated the Tyrians with decent consideration; but it was no longer certain, now that he had made them his enemies.

Chances of the Tyrians—their resolution not unreasonable.

What passed among the Persian fleet under

nothing in the least conformable to the description of Alexander's time.

[1] Arrian, ii. 18, 3; ii. 21, 4; ii. 22, 8.

Autophradates in the Ægean, when they were informed, first that Alexander was master of the other Phenician cities—next, that he was commencing the siege of Tyre—we know very imperfectly. The Tyrian prince Azemilchus brought home his ships for the defence of his own city[1]; the Sidonian and Aradian ships also went home, no longer serving against a power to whom their own cities had submitted; but the Cyprians hesitated longer before they declared themselves. If Darius, or even Autophradates without Darius, instead of abandoning Tyre altogether (as they actually did), had energetically aided the resistance which it offered to Alexander, as the interests of Persia dictated—the Cypriot ships might not improbably have been retained on that side in the struggle. Lastly, the Tyrians might indulge a hope, that their Phenician brethren, if ready to serve Alexander against Persia, would be nowise hearty as his instruments for crushing a kindred city. These contingencies, though ultimately they all turned out in favour of Alexander, were in the beginning sufficiently promising to justify the intrepid resolution of the Tyrians; who were farther encouraged by promises of aid from the powerful fleets of their colony Carthage. To that city, whose deputies were then within their walls for some religious solemnities, they sent many of their wives and children[2].

[1] Azemilchus was with Autophradates when Alexander declared hostility against Tyre (Arrian, ii. 15, 10); he was in Tyre when it was captured (Arrian, ii. 24, 8).

[2] Curtius, iv. 2, 10; Arrian, ii. 24, 8; Diodor. xvii. 40, 41. Curtius (iv. 2, 15) says that Alexander sent envoys to the Tyrians to invite them to peace; that the Tyrians not only refused the propositions, but

Alexander began the siege of Tyre without any fleet; the Sidonian and Aradian ships not having yet come. It was his first task to construct a solid mole two hundred feet broad, reaching across the half mile of channel between the mainland and the islet. He pressed into his service labouring hands by thousands from the neighbourhood; he had stones in abundance from Palætyrus, and wood from the forests in Lebanon. But the work, though prosecuted with ardour and perseverance, under pressing instigations from Alexander, was tedious and toilsome, even near the mainland, where the Tyrians could do little to impede it; and became far more tedious as it advanced into the sea, so as to be exposed to their obstruction, as well as to damage from winds and waves. The Tyrian triremes and small boats perpetually annoyed the workmen, and destroyed parts of the work, in spite of all the protection devised by the Macedonians, who planted two towers in front of their advancing mole, and discharged projectiles from engines provided for the purpose. At length, by unremitting efforts, the mole was pushed forward until it came nearly across the channel to the city-wall; when suddenly, on a day of strong wind, the Tyrians sent forth a fireship loaded with combustibles, which they drove against the front of the mole and set fire to the two towers. At the same time, the full

Alexander constructs a mole across the strait between Tyre and the mainland. The project is defeated.

put the deputies to death, contrary to the law of nations. Arrian mentions nothing about this sending of deputies, which he would hardly have omitted to do had he found it stated in his authorities, since it tends to justify the proceedings of Alexander. Moreover it is not conformable to Alexander's temperament, after what had passed between him and the Tyrians.

naval force of the city, ships and little boats, was sent forth to land men at once on all parts of the mole. So successful was this attack, that all the Macedonian engines were burnt,—the outer woodwork which kept the mole together was torn up in many places,—and a large part of the structure came to pieces[1].

Surrender of the princes of Cyprus to Alexander—he gets hold of the main Phenician and Cyprian fleet.

Alexander had thus not only to construct fresh engines, but also to begin the mole nearly anew. He resolved to give it greater breadth and strength, for the purpose of carrying more towers abreast in front, and for better defence against lateral attacks. But it had now become plain to him, that while the Tyrians were masters of the sea, no efforts by land alone would enable him to take the town. Leaving Perdikkas and Kraterus therefore to reconstruct the mole and build new engines, he himself repaired to Sidon, for the purpose of assembling as large a fleet as he could. He got together triremes from various quarters—two from Rhodes, ten from the seaports in Lykia, three from Soli and Mallus. But his principal force was obtained by putting in requisition the ships of the Phenician towns, Sidon, Byblus, and Aradus, now subject to him. These ships, eighty in number, had left the Persian admiral and come to Sidon, there awaiting his orders; while not long afterwards, the princes of Cyprus came thither also, tendering to him their powerful fleet of 120 ships of war[2]. He was now master of

[1] Arrian, ii. 18, 19; Diodor. xvii. 42; Curtius, iv. 3, 6, 7.

[2] Arrian, ii. 20, 1–4; Curtius, iv. 2, 14. It evinces how strongly Arrian looks at everything from Alexander's point of view, when we find him telling us, that that monarch *forgave* the Phenicians and Cy-

a fleet of 200 sail, comprising the most part, and the best part, of the Persian navy. This was the consummation of Macedonian triumph—the last real and effective weapon wrested from the grasp of Persia. The prognostic afforded by the eagle near the ships at Miletus, as interpreted by Alexander, had now been fulfilled; since by successful operations on land, he had conquered and brought into his power a superior Persian fleet[1].

He appears before Tyre with a numerous fleet, and blocks up the place by sea.

Having directed these ships to complete their equipments and training, with Macedonians as soldiers on board, Alexander put himself at the head of some light troops for an expedition of eleven days against the Arabian mountaineers on Libanus, whom he dispersed or put down, though not without some personal exposure and hazard[2]. On returning to Sidon, he found Kleander arrived with a reinforcement of 4000 Grecian hoplites, welcome auxiliaries for prosecuting the siege. Then, going aboard his fleet in the harbour of Sidon, he sailed with it in good battle order to Tyre, hoping that the Tyrians would come out and fight. But they kept within, struck with surprise and consternation; having not before known that their fellow-Phenicians were now among the besiegers. Alexander, having ascertained that the Tyrians would not accept a sea-fight, immediately caused their

prians for their adherence and past service in the Persian fleet, considering that they had acted under compulsion.

[1] Arrian, i. 18, 15. In the siege of Tyre (four centuries earlier) by the Assyrian monarch Salmaneser, Sidon and other Phenician towns had lent their ships to the besieger (Menander apud Joseph. Antiq. Jud. ix. 14, 2).

[2] Arrian, ii. 20, 5; Plutarch, Alexander, 24.

two harbours to be blocked up and watched; that on the north, towards Sidon, by the Cyprians—that on the south, towards Egypt, by the Phenicians[1].

Capture of Tyre by storm—desperate resistance of the citizens.

From this time forward, the doom of Tyre was certain. The Tyrians could no longer offer obstruction to the mole, which was completed across the channel and brought up to the town. Engines were planted upon it to batter the walls; moveable towers were rolled up to take them by assault; attack was also made from seaward. Yet though reduced altogether to the defensive, the Tyrians still displayed obstinate bravery, and exhausted all the resources of ingenuity in repelling the besiegers. So gigantic was the strength of the wall fronting the mole, and even that of the northern side fronting Sidon, that none of Alexander's engines could make any breach in it; but on the south side towards Egypt he was more successful. A large breach having been made in this south-wall, he assaulted it with two ships manned by the hypaspists and the soldiers of his phalanx: he himself commanded in one and Admêtus in the other. At the same time he caused the town to be menaced all round, at every approachable point, for the purpose of distracting the attention of the defenders. Himself and his two ships having been rowed close up to the breach in the south wall, boarding bridges were thrown out from each deck, upon which he and Admêtus rushed forward with their respective storming-parties. Admêtus got upon the wall, but was there slain; Alexander also was among the

[1] Arrian, ii. 20, 9-16; Curtius, iv. 3, 11.

first to mount, and the two parties got such a footing on the wall as to overpower all resistance. At the same time, his ships also forced their way into the two harbours, so that Tyre came on all sides into his power[1].

Though the walls were now lost, and resistance had become desperate, the gallant defenders did not lose their courage. They barricaded the streets, and concentrated their strength especially at a defensible post called the Agenorion, or chapel of Agenor. Here the battle again raged furiously until they were overpowered by the Macedonians, incensed with the long toils of the previous siege, as well as by the slaughter of some of their prisoners, whom the Tyrians had killed publicly on the battlements. All who took shelter in the temple of Hêraklês were spared by Alexander from respect to the sanctuary: among the number were the prince Azemilchus, a few leading Tyrians, the Carthaginian envoys, and some children of both sexes. The Sidonians also, displaying a tardy sentiment of kindred, and making partial amends for the share which they had taken in the capture, preserved some lives from the sword of the conqueror[2]. But the greater number of the adult freemen perished with arms in their hands; while 2000 of them who survived, either from disabling wounds, or from the fatigue of the slaughterers, were hanged on the sea-shore by order of Alexander[3]. The females,

Surviving males, 2000 in number, hanged by order of Alexander. The remaining captives sold.

[1] Arrian, ii. 23, 24; Curtius, iv. 4, 11; Diodor. xvii. 46.

[2] Curtius, iv. 4, 15.

[3] This is mentioned both by Curtius (iv. 4, 17) and by Diodorus (xvii. 46). It is not mentioned by Arrian, and perhaps may not have

the children, and the slaves, were sold to the slave-merchant. The number sold is said to have been about 30,000: a total rather small, as we must assume slaves to be included; but we are told that many had been previously sent away to Carthage[1].

B.C. 332, July–Aug. Duration of the siege for seven months. Sacrifice of Alexander to Herakles.

Thus master of Tyre, Alexander marched into the city and consummated his much-desired sacrifice to Herakles. His whole force, land and naval, fully armed and arrayed, took part in the procession. A more costly hecatomb had never been offered to that God, when we consider that it had been purchased by all the toils of an unnecessary siege, and by the extirpation of these free and high-spirited citizens, his former worshipers. What the loss of the Macedonians had been, we cannot say. The number of their slain is stated by Arrian at 400, which must be greatly beneath the truth; for the courage and skill of the besieged had prolonged the siege to the prodigious period of seven months, though Alexander had left no means untried to accomplish it sooner[2].

Second letter from Darius to Alexander, who requires unconditional submission.

Towards the close of the siege of Tyre, Alexander received and rejected a second proposition from Darius, offering 10,000 talents, with the cession of all the territory westward of the Euphrates, as ransom for his mother and wife, and proposing that Alexander should become his son-in-law as well as his ally. "If I were Alexander (said Parmenio) I

found a place in Ptolemy or Aristobulus; but I see no ground for disbelieving it.

[1] Arrian, iv. 24, 9; Diodorus, xvii. 46.

[2] The resuscitating force of commercial industry is seen by the fact, that in spite of this total destruction, Tyre again rose to be a wealthy and flourishing city (Strabo, xvi. p. 757).

should accept such terms, instead of plunging into farther peril."—"So would I (replied Alexander) if I were Parmenio; but since I am Alexander, I must return a different answer." His answer to Darius was to this effect:—"I want neither your money nor your cession. All your money and territory are already mine, and you are tendering to me a part in place of the whole. If I choose to marry your daughter, I *shall* marry her—whether you give her to me or not. Come hither to me, if you wish to obtain from me any act of friendship[1]." Alexander might spare the submissive and the prostrate; but he could not brook an equal or a competitor, and his language towards them was that of brutal insolence. Of course this was the last message sent by Darius, who now saw, if he had not before seen, that he had no chance open except by the renewal of war.

The Macedonian fleet overpowers the Persian, and becomes master of the Ægean with the islands.

Being thus entire master of Syria, Phenicia, and Palestine, and having accepted the voluntary submission of the Jews, Alexander marched forward to conquer Egypt. He had determined, before he undertook any farther expedition into the interior of the Persian empire, to make himself master of all the coast-lands which kept open the communications of the Persians with Greece, so as to secure his rear against any serious hostility. His great fear was, of Grecian soldiers or cities raised against him by Persian gold[2]; and Egypt was the last re-

[1] Arrian, ii. 25, 5; Curtius, iv. 5. The answer is more insolent in the naked simplicity of Arrian, than in the pomp of Curtius. Plutarch (Alexand. 29) both abridges and softens it. Diodorus also gives the answer differently (xvii. 54)—and represents the embassy as coming somewhat later in time, after Alexander's return from Egypt.

[2] Arrian, ii. 17, 4

maining possession of the Persians, which gave them the means of acting upon Greece. Those means were indeed now prodigiously curtailed by the feeble condition of the Persian fleet in the Ægean, unable to contend with the increasing fleet of the Macedonian admirals Hegelochus and Amphoterus, now numbering 160 sail[1]. During the summer of 332 B.C., while Alexander was prosecuting the siege of Tyre, these admirals recovered all the important acquisitions—Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos—which had been made by Memnon for the Persian interests. The inhabitants of Tenedos invited them and ensured their success; those of Chios attempted to do the same, but were coerced by Pharnabazus, who retained the city by means of his insular partisans, Apollonides and others, with a military force. The Macedonian admirals laid siege to the town, and were presently enabled to carry it by their friends within. Pharnabazus was here captured with his entire force; twelve triremes thoroughly armed and manned, thirty store-ships, several privateers, and 3000 Grecian mercenaries. Aristonikus, philo-Persian despot of Methymna—arriving at Chios shortly afterwards, but ignorant of the capture—was entrapped into the harbour, and made prisoner. There remained only Mitylênê, which was held for the Persians by the Athenian Chares, with a garrison of 2000 men; who however, seeing no hope of holding out against the Macedonians, consented to evacuate the city on condition of a free departure. The Persians were thus expelled from the sea, from all footing among

[1] Curtius, iv. 5, 14.

the Grecian islands, and from the vicinity of Greece and Macedonia[1].

March of Alexander towards Egypt—siege of Gaza.

These successes were in full progress, when Alexander himself directed his march from Tyre to Egypt, stopping in his way to besiege Gaza. This considerable town, the last before entering on the desert track between Syria and Egypt, was situated between one and two miles from the sea. It was built upon a lofty artificial mound, and encircled with a high wall; but its main defence was derived from the deep sand immediately around it, as well as from the mud and quicksand on its coast. It was defended by a brave man, the eunuch Batis, with a strong garrison of Arabs, and abundant provision of every kind. Confiding in the strength of the place, Batis refused to admit Alexander. Moreover his judgment was confirmed by the Macedonian engineers themselves, who, when Alexander first surveyed the walls, pronounced it to be impregnable, chiefly from the height of its supporting mound. But Alexander could not endure the thought of tacitly confessing his inability to take Gaza. The more difficult the enterprise, the greater was the charm for him, and the greater would be the astonishment produced all around when he should be seen to have triumphed[2].

[1] Curtius, iv. 5, 14–22; Arrian, iii. 2, 4–8.

[2] Arrian, ii. 26, 5. Οἱ δὲ μηχανοποιοὶ γνώμην ἀπεδείκνυντο, ἄπορον εἶναι βίᾳ ἑλεῖν τὸ τεῖχος, διὰ ὕψος τοῦ χώματος· ἀλλ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐδόκει αἱρετέον εἶναι, ὅσῳ ἀπορώτερον· ἐκπλήξειν γὰρ τοὺς πολεμίους τὸ ἔργον τῷ παραλόγῳ ἐπὶ μέγα, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἑλεῖν αἰσχρὸν εἶναί οἱ, λεγόμενον ἔς τε τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ Δαρεῖον.

About the fidelity, and obstinate defensive courage, shown more than once by the inhabitants of Gaza—see Polybius, xvi. 40.

His first assaults fail—he is wounded—he erects an immense mound round the town.

He began by erecting a mound south of the city, close by the wall, for the purpose of bringing up his battering engines. This external mound was completed, and the engines had begun to batter the wall, when a well-planned sally by the garrison overthrew the assailants and destroyed the engines. The timely aid of Alexander himself with his hypaspists, protected their retreat; but he himself, after escaping a snare from a pretended Arabian deserter, received a severe wound through the shield and the breastplate into the shoulder, by a dart discharged from a catapult; as the prophet Aristander had predicted—giving assurance at the same time, that Gaza would fall into his hands[1]. During the treatment of his wound, he ordered the engines employed at Tyre to be brought up by sea; and caused his mound to be carried around the whole circumference of the town, so as to render it approachable from every point. This Herculean work, the description of which we read with astonishment, was 250 feet high all round, and two stadia (1240 feet) broad[2]; the loose sand around could hardly have been suitable, so that materials must have been brought up from a distance. The undertaking was at length completed; in what length of time we do not know, but it must have been considerable—though doubtless thousands of

[1] Arrian, ii. 26, 27; Curtius, iv. 6, 12-18; Plutarch, Alexand. 25.

[2] Arrian, ii. 27, 5. χῶμα χωννύναι ἐν κύκλῳ παντόθεν τῆς πόλεως. It is certainly possible, as Droysen remarks (Gesch. Alex. des Grossen, p. 199), that παντόθεν is not to be interpreted with literal strictness, but only as meaning in *many different portions* of the walled circuit. Yet if this had been intended, Arrian would surely have said χώματα in the plural, not χῶμα.

labourers would be pressed in from the circumjacent country[1].

Gaza was now attacked at all points by battering-rams, by mines, and by projectile engines with various missiles. Presently the walls were breached in several places, though the defenders were unremitting in their efforts to repair the damaged parts. Alexander attempted three distinct general assaults; but in all three he was repulsed by the bravery of the Gazæans. At length, after still farther breaching of the wall, he renewed for the fourth time his attempt to storm. The entire Macedonian phalanx being brought up to attack at different points, the greatest emulation reigned among the officers. The Æakid Neoptolemus was first to mount the wall; but the other divisions manifested hardly less ardour, and the town was at length taken. Its gallant defenders resisted, with unabated spirit, to the last; and all fell in their posts, the incensed soldiery being no way disposed to give quarter.

Gaza is taken by storm, after a siege of two months.

One prisoner alone was reserved for special treatment—the prince or governor himself, the eunuch Batis; who, having manifested the greatest energy and valour, was taken severely wounded, yet still alive. In this condition he was brought by Leonnatus and Philôtas into the presence of Alexander, who cast upon him looks of vengeance and fury. The Macedonian prince had undertaken the siege mainly in order to prove to the world that he could overcome difficulties insuperable to others. But he had incurred so much loss, spent so much time and

The garrison are all slain, except the governor Batis, who becomes prisoner, severely wounded.

[1] Diodorus (xvii. 48) states the whole duration of the siege as two months. This seems rather under than over the probable truth.

labour, and undergone so many repulses before he succeeded,—that the palm of honour belonged rather to the minority vanquished than to the multitude of victors. To such disappointment, which would sting Alexander in the tenderest point, is to be added the fact, that he had himself incurred great personal risk and received a severe wound. Here was ample ground for violent anger; which was moreover still farther exasperated by the appearance of Batis—an eunuch—a black man—tall and robust, but at the same time fat and lumpish—and doubtless at the moment covered with blood and dirt. Such visible circumstances, repulsive to eyes familiar with Grecian gymnastics, contributed to kindle the wrath of Alexander to its highest pitch. After the siege of Tyre, his indignation had been satiated by the hanging of the 2000 surviving combatants; here, to discharge the pressure of a still stronger feeling, there remained only the single captive, upon whom therefore he resolved to inflict a punishment as novel as it was cruel. He directed the feet of Batis to be bored, and brazen rings to be passed through them; after which the naked body of this brave man, yet surviving, was tied with cords to the tail of a chariot driven by Alexander himself, and dragged at full speed amidst the triumphant jeers and shouts of the army[1]. Herein

Wrath of Alexander against Batis, whom he causes to be tied to a chariot, and dragged round the town.

[1] Curtius, iv. 6, 25–30; Dionys. Hal. De Comp. Verbor. p. 123–125—with the citation there given from Hegesias of Magnesia. Diodorus (xvii. 48, 49) simply mentions Gaza in two sentences, but gives no details of any kind.

Arrian says nothing about the treatment of Batis, nor did he probably find anything about it in Ptolemy or Aristobulus. There are assignable reasons why they should pass it over in silence, as disgraceful

Alexander, emulous even from childhood of the exploits of his legendary ancestor Achilles, copied the ignominious treatment described in the Iliad as inflicted on the dead body of Hektor[1].

This proceeding of Alexander, the product of Homeric reminiscences operating upon an infuriated and vindictive temperament, stands out in respect of barbarity from all that we read respecting the treatment of conquered towns in antiquity. His remaining measures were conformable to received usage. The wives and children of the Gazæans were sold into slavery. New inhabitants were admitted from the neighbourhood, and a garrison was placed there to hold the town for the Macedonians[2].

B.C. 332, autumn. Alexander enters Egypt, and occupies it without resistance.

The two sieges of Tyre and Gaza, which occupied both together nine months[3], were the hardest fighting that Alexander had ever encountered, or in fact ever did encounter throughout his life. After such toils, the march to Egypt, which he now commenced (October 332 B.C.), was an affair of holiday and triumph. Mazakes, the satrap of Egypt, having few Persian troops and a disaffected native population, was noway disposed to resist the approaching

to Alexander. But Arrian, at the same time, says nothing inconsistent with or contradicting the statement of Curtius; while he himself recognises how emulous Alexander was of the proceedings of Achilles (vii. 14, 7).

The passage describing this scene, cited from the lost author Hegesias by Dionysius of Halikarnassus, as an example of bad rhythm and taste, has the merit of bringing out the details respecting the person of Batis, which were well calculated to disgust and aggravate the wrath of Alexander. The bad taste of Hegesias as a writer does not diminish his credibility as a witness.

[1] Arrian, vii. 14, 7.

[2] Arrian, ii. 27, 11. About the circumstances and siege of Gaza, see the work of Stark, Gaza und die Philistäische Küste, p. 242. Leip. 1852.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 48; Josephus, Antiq. xi. 4.

conqueror. Seven days' march brought Alexander and his army from Gaza to Pelusium, the frontier fortress of Egypt, commanding the eastern branch of the Nile, whither his fleet, under the command of Hephæstion, had come also. Here he found not only open gates and a submissive governor, but also crowds of Egyptians assembled to welcome him[1]. He placed a garrison in Pelusium, sent his fleet up the river to Memphis, and marched himself to the same place by land. The satrap Mazakes surrendered himself, with all the treasure in the city, 800 talents in amount, and much precious furniture. Here Alexander reposed some time, offering splendid sacrifices to the Gods generally, and especially to the Egyptian God Apis; to which he added gymnastic and musical matches, sending to Greece for the most distinguished artists.

From Memphis, he descended the westernmost branch of the Nile to Kanôpus at its mouth, from whence he sailed westerly along the shore to look at the island of Pharos, celebrated in Homer, and the lake Mareôtis. Reckoning Egypt now as a portion of his empire, and considering that the business of keeping down an unquiet population, as well as of collecting a large revenue, would have to be performed by his extraneous land and sea force, he saw the necessity of withdrawing the seat of government from Memphis, where both the Persians and the natives had maintained it, and of founding a new city of his own on the seaboard, convenient for communication with Greece and Macedonia. His imagination, susceptible to all

He determines on founding Alexandria.

[1] Arrian, iii. 1, 3; Curtius, iv. 7, 1, 2; Diodor. xvii. 49.

Homeric impressions and influenced by a dream, first fixed upon the isle of Pharos as a suitable place for his intended city[1]. Perceiving soon, however, that this little islé was inadequate by itself, he included it as part of a larger city to be founded on the adjacent mainland. The Gods were consulted, and encouraging responses were obtained; upon which Alexander himself marked out the circuit of the walls, the direction of the principal streets, and the sites of numerous temples to Grecian Gods as well as Egyptian[2]. It was thus that the first stone was laid of the mighty, populous, and busy Alexandria; which however the founder himself never lived to see, and wherein he was only destined to repose as a corpse. The site of the place, between the sea and the Lake Mareôtis, was found airy and healthy, as well as convenient for shipping and commerce. The protecting island of Pharos gave the means of forming two good harbours for ships coming by sea, on a coast harbourless elsewhere; while the Lake Mareôtis, communicating by various canals with the river Nile, received with facility the exportable produce from the interior[3]. As soon as houses were ready, commencement was made by transporting to them in mass the population of the neighbouring town of Kanôpus, and probably of other towns besides, by the intendant Kleomenes[4].

Alexandria became afterwards the capital of the

[1] Curtius, iv. 8, 1-4; Plutarch, Alexand. 26.

[2] Arrian, iii. 1, 8; Curtius, iv. 8, 2-6; Diodor. xvii. 52.

[3] Strabo, xvii. p. 793. Other authors however speak of the salubrity of Alexandria less favourably than Strabo: see St. Croix, Examen des Hist. d'Alexandre, p. 287.

[4] Pseudo-Aristotle, Œconomic. ii. 32.

Ptolemaic princes. It acquired immense grandeur and population during their rule of two centuries and a half, when their enormous revenues were spent greatly in its improvement and decoration. But we cannot reasonably ascribe to Alexander himself any prescience of such an imposing future. He intended it as a place from which he could conveniently rule Egypt, considered as a portion of his extensive empire all round the Ægean; and had Egypt remained thus a fraction, instead of becoming a substantive imperial whole, Alexandria would probably not have risen beyond mediocrity[1].

His visit to the temple and oracle of Ammon. The oracle proclaims him to be the son of Zeus.

The other most notable incident, which distinguished the four or five months' stay of Alexander in Egypt, was his march through the sandy desert to the temple of Zeus Ammon. This is chiefly memorable as it marks his increasing self-adoration and inflation above the limits of humanity. His achievements during the last three years had so transcended the expectations of every one, himself included—the Gods had given to him such incessant good fortune, and so paralysed or put down his enemies—that the hypothesis of a superhuman personality seemed the natural explanation of such a superhuman career[2]. He had to look back to the heroic legends, and to his ancestors Perseus and Herakles, to find a worthy prototype[3]. Conceiving

[1] Arrian, iii. 5, 4-9. Tacitus (Annal. i. 11) says about Egypt under the Romans—"provinciam aditu difficilem, annonæ fecundam, superstitione et lasciviâ discordem et mobilem, insciam legum, ignaram magistratuum," &c. Compare Polybius ap. Strabon. xvii. p. 797.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 51. τεκμήρια δ' ἔσεσθαι τῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γενέσεως τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι κατορθωμάτων (answer of the priest of Ammon to Alexander).

[3] Arrian, iii. 3, 2.

himself to be (like them) the son of Zeus, with only a nominal human parentage, he resolved to go and ascertain the fact by questioning the infallible oracle of Zeus Ammon. His march of several days, through a sandy desert—always fatiguing, sometimes perilous,—was distinguished by manifest evidences of the favour of the Gods. Unexpected rain fell just when the thirsty soldiers required water. When the guides lost their track, from shifting of the sand, on a sudden two speaking serpents, or two ravens, appeared preceding the march and indicating the right direction. Such were the statements made by Ptolemy, Aristobulus, and Kallisthenes, companions and contemporaries; while Arrian, four centuries afterwards, announces his positive conviction that there was a divine intervention on behalf of Alexander, though he cannot satisfy himself about the details[1]. The priest of Zeus Ammon addressed Alexander, as being the son of the God, and farther assured him that his career would be one of uninterrupted victory, until he was taken away to the Gods; while his friends also, who consulted the oracle for their own satisfaction, received for answer that the rendering of divine honours to him would be acceptable to Zeus. After profuse sacrifices and presents, Alexander quitted the oracle, with a full and sincere faith that he really was the son of Zeus Ammon; which faith was farther confirmed by declarations transmitted to him from other oracles

[1] Arrian, iii. 3, 12. Καὶ ὅτι μὲν θεῖόν τι ξυνεπέλαβεν αὐτῷ, ἔχω ἰσχυρίσασθαι, ὅτι καὶ τὸ εἰκὸς ταύτῃ ἔχει· τὸ δ' ἀρκεῖς τοῦ λόγου ἀφείλοντο οἱ ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐξηγησάμενοι.

Compare Curtius, iv. 7, 12-15; Diodor. xvii. 49-51; Plutarch, Alex. 27; Kallisthenes ap. Strabon. xvii. p. 814.

—that of Erythræ in Ionia, and of Branchidæ near Miletus[1]. Though he did not directly order himself to be addressed as the son of Zeus, he was pleased with those who volunteered such a recognition, and angry with sceptics or scoffers, who disbelieved the oracle of Ammon. Plutarch thinks that this was a mere political manœuvre of Alexander, for the purpose of overawing the non-Hellenic population over whom he was enlarging his empire[2]. But it seems rather to have been a genuine faith,—a simple exaggeration of that exorbitant vanity which from the beginning reigned so largely in his bosom. He was indeed aware that it was repugnant to the leading Macedonians in many ways, but especially as a deliberate insult to the memory of Philip. This is the theme always touched upon in moments of dissatisfaction. To Parmenio, to Philôtas, to Kleitus, and other principal officers, the insolence of the king, in disclaiming Philip and putting himself above the level of humanity, appeared highly offensive. Discontents on this subject among the Macedonian officers, though condemned to silence by fear and admiration of Alexander, became serious, and will be found re-appearing hereafter[3].

B.C. 331, January. The last month of Alexander's stay in Egypt was passed at Memphis. While nominating various officers for the permanent administration of the country, he also received a visit of Hegelochus his

[1] Kallisthenes, Fragm. xvi. ap. Alexand. Magn. Histor. Scriptor. ed. Geier. p. 257; Strabo, xvii. p. 814.

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 28. Arrian hints at the same explanation (vii. 29, 6).

[3] Curtius, iv. 10, 3 — "fastidio esse patriam, abdicari Philippum patrem, cœlum vanis cogitationibus petere." Arrian, iii. 26, 1; Curtius, vi. 9, 18. vi. 11, 23.

admiral, who brought as prisoners Aristonikus of Methymna, and other despots of the various insular Grecian cities. Alexander ordered them to be handed over to their respective cities, to be dealt with as the citizens pleased; all except the Chian Apollonides, who was sent to Elephantinê in the south of Egypt for detention. In most of the cities, the despots had incurred such violent hatred, that when delivered up, they were tortured and put to death[1]. Pharnabazus also had been among the prisoners, but had found means to escape from his guards when the fleet touched at Kos[2].

Arrangements made by Alexander at Memphis—Grecian prisoners brought from the Ægean.

In the early spring, after receiving reinforcements of Greeks and Thracians, Alexander marched into Phenicia. It was there that he regulated the affairs of Phenicia, Syria, and Greece, prior to his intended expedition into the interior against Darius. He punished the inhabitants of Samaria, who had revolted and burnt alive the Macedonian prefect Andromachus[3]. In addition to all the business transacted, Alexander made costly presents to the Tyrian Herakles, and offered splendid sacrifices to other Gods. Choice festivals with tragedy were also celebrated, analogous to the Dionysia at Athens, with the best actors and chorists contending for the prize. The princes of Cyprus vied with each other in doing honour to the son of Zeus Ammon; each undertaking the duty of chorêgus, getting up at his own cost a drama with distinguished chorus and actors, and striving to obtain the prize from pre-appointed judges—as was practised among the ten tribes at Athens[4].

B.C. 331, February–March.

He proceeds to Phenicia—message from Athens. Splendid festivals. Reinforcements sent to Antipater.

[1] Curtius, iv. 8, 11.
[2] Arrian, iii. 2, 8, 9.
[3] Curtius, iv. 8, 10.
[4] Plutarch, Alexand. 29; Arrian, *l. c.*

B.C. 331, June–July. He marches to the Euphrates —crosses it without opposition at Thapsakus.

In the midst of these religious and festive exhibitions, Alexander was collecting magazines for his march into the interior[1]. He had already sent forward a detachment to Thapsakus, the usual ford of the Euphrates, to throw bridges over the river. The Persian Mazæus was on guard on the other side, with a small force of 3000 men, 2000 of them Greeks; not sufficient to hinder the bridges from being built, but only to hinder them from being carried completely over to the left bank. After eleven days of march from Phenicia, Alexander and his whole army reached Thapsakus. Mazæus, on the other side, as soon as he saw the main army arrive, withdrew his small force without delay, and retreated to the Tigris; so that the two bridges were completed, and Alexander crossed forthwith[2].

March across from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Alexander fords the Tigris above Nineveh, without resistance.

Once over the Euphrates, Alexander had the option of marching down the left bank of that river to Babylon, the chief city of the Persian empire, and the natural place to find Darius[3]. But this march (as we know from Xenophon, who made it with the Ten Thousand Greeks) would be one of extreme suffering and through a desert country where no provisions were to be got. Moreover, Mazæus in retreating had taken a north-easterly direction

[1] Arrian, iii. 6, 12.

[2] Arrian, iii. 7, 1-6; Curtius, iv. 9, 12—"undecimis castris pervenit ad Euphraten."

[3] So Alexander considers Babylon (Arrian, ii. 17, 3–10)—*προχωρησάντων ξὺν τῇ δυνάμει ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνά τε καὶ Δαρεῖον.....τόν τε ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνος στόλον ποιησόμεθα*, &c. This is the explanation of Arrian's remark, iii. 7, 6—where he assigns the reason why Alexander, after passing the Euphrates at Thapsakus, did not take the straight road towards Babylon. Cyrus the younger marched directly to Babylon to attack Artaxerxes. Susa, Ekbatana, and Persepolis were more distant, and less exposed to an enemy from the west.

towards the upper part of the Tigris; and some prisoners reported that Darius with his main army was behind the Tigris, intending to defend the passage of that river against Alexander. The Tigris appears not to be fordable below Nineveh (Mosul). Accordingly he directed his march, first nearly northward, having the Euphrates on his left hand; next eastward across Northern Mesopotamia, having the Armenian mountains on his left hand. On reaching the ford of the Tigris, he found it absolutely undefended. Not a single enemy being in sight, he forded the river as soon as possible, with all his infantry, cavalry, and baggage. The difficulties and perils of crossing were extreme, from the depth of the water, above their breasts, the rapidity of the current, and the slippery footing[1]. A resolute and vigilant enemy might have rendered the passage almost impossible. But the good fortune of Alexander was not less conspicuous in what his enemies left undone, than in what they actually did[2].

B.C. 331, Sept. 20. Eclipse of the moon. Alexander approaches near to the army of Darius in position.

After this fatiguing passage, Alexander rested for two days. During the night an eclipse of the moon occurred, nearly total; which spread consternation among the army, combined with complaints against his overweening insolence, and mistrust as to the unknown regions on which they were entering. Alexander, while offering solemn sacrifices to Sun, Moon, and Earth, combated the prevailing depression by declarations from his own prophet Aristander and from Egyptian astrologers, who pro-

[1] Arrian, iii. 7, 8; Diodor. xvii. 55; Curtius, iv. 9, 17–24. "Magna munimenta regni Tigris atque Euphrates erant," is a part of the speech put into the mouth of Darius before the battle of Arbela, by Curtius (iv. 14, 10). Both these great defences were abandoned.

[2] Curtius, iv. 9, 23; Plutarch, Alexand. 39.

claimed that Helios favoured the Greeks, and Selênê the Persians; hence the eclipse of the moon portended victory to the Macedonians—and victory too (so Aristander promised), before the next new moon. Having thus reassured the soldiers, Alexander marched for four days in a south-easterly direction through the territory called Aturia, with the Tigris on his right hand, and the Gordyene or Kurd mountains on his left. Encountering a small advanced guard of the Persians, he here learnt from prisoners that Darius with his main host was not far off[1].

B.C. 331, September. Inaction of Darius since the defeat at Issus.

Nearly two years had elapsed since the ruinous defeat of Issus. What Darius had been doing during this long interval, and especially during the first half of it, we are unable to say. We hear only of one proceeding on his part—his missions, twice repeated, to Alexander, tendering or entreating peace, with the especial view of recovering his captive family. Nothing else does he appear to have done, either to retrieve the losses of the past, or to avert the perils of the future; nothing, to save his fleet from passing into the hands of the conqueror; nothing, to relieve either Tyre or Gaza, the sieges of which collectively occupied Alexander for near ten months. The disgraceful flight of Darius at Issus had already lost him the confidence of several of his most valuable servants. The Macedonian exile Amyntas, a brave and energetic man, with the best of the Grecian mercenaries, gave up the Persian cause as lost[2], and tried to set up for himself,

[1] Arrian, iii. 7, 12; iii. 8, 3. Curtius, iv. 10, 11–18.

[2] Arrian, ii. 13; Curtius, iv. 1, 27–30—"cum in illo statu rerum id quemque, quod occupasset, habiturum arbitraretur" (Amyntas).

in which attempt he failed and perished in Egypt. The satrap of Egypt, penetrated with contempt for the timidity of his master, was induced, by that reason as well as by others, to throw open the country to Alexander[1]. Having incurred so deplorable a loss, as well in reputation as in territory, Darius had the strongest motives to redeem it by augmented vigour.

Paralysing effect upon him produced by the captivity of his mother and wife.

But he was paralysed by the fact, that his mother, his wife, and several of his children, had fallen into the hands of the conqueror. Among the countless advantages growing out of the victory of Issus, this acquisition was not the least. It placed Darius in the condition of one who had given hostages for good behaviour to his enemy. The Persian kings were often in the habit of exacting from satraps or generals the deposit of their wives and families, as a pledge for fidelity; and Darius himself had received this guarantee from Memnon, as a condition of entrusting him with the Persian fleet[2]. Bound by the like chains himself, towards one who had now become his superior, Darius was afraid to act with energy, lest success should bring down evil upon his captive family. By allowing Alexander to subdue unopposed all the territory west of the Euphrates, he hoped to be allowed to retain his empire eastward, and to ransom back his family at an enormous price. Such propositions did satisfy Parmenio, and would probably have satisfied even

[1] Arrian, iii. 1, 3. *τήν τε ἐν Ἰσσῷ μάχην ὅπως συνέβη πεπυσμένος* (the satrap of Egypt) *καὶ Δαρεῖον ὅτι αἰσχρᾷ φυγῇ ἔφυγε*, &c.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 23. Compare Xenophon, Anabasis, i. 4, 9; Herodot. vii. 10.

Philip, had Philip been the victor. The insatiate nature of Alexander had not yet been fully proved. It was only when the latter contemptuously rejected everything short of surrender at discretion, that Darius began to take measures east of the Euphrates for defending what yet remained.

Good treatment of the captive females by Alexander —necessary to keep up their value as hostages.

The conduct of Alexander towards the regal hostages, honourable as it was to his sentiment, evinced at the same time that he knew their value as a subject of political negotiation[1]. It was essential that he should treat them with the full deference due to their rank, if he desired to keep up their price as hostages in the eyes of Darius as well as of his own army. He carried them along with his

[1] The praise bestowed upon the continence of Alexander, for refusing to visit Statira the wife of Darius, is exaggerated even to absurdity.

In regard to women, Alexander was by temperament cold, the opposite of his father Philip. During his youth, his development was so tardy, that there was even a surmise of some physical disability (Hieronymus ap. Athenæ. x. p. 435). As to the most beautiful persons, of both sexes, he had only to refuse the numerous tenders made to him by those who sought to gain his favour (Plutarch, Alex. 22). Moreover, after the capture of Damascus, he did select for himself, from among the female captives, Barsinê, the widow of his illustrious rival Memnon; daughter of Artabazus, a beautiful woman of engaging manners, and above all, distinguished, by having received Hellenic education, from the simply Oriental harem of Darius (Plutarch, Alex. 21). In adopting the widow of Memnon as his mistress, Alexander may probably have had present to his imagination the example of his legendary ancestor Neoptolemus, whose tender relations with Andromachê, widow of his enemy Hektor, would not be forgotten by any reader of Euripides. Alexander had by Barsinê a son called Herakles.

Lastly, Alexander was so absorbed by ambition,—so overcharged with the duties and difficulties of command, which he always performed himself,—and so continually engaged in fatiguing bodily effort,—that he had little leisure left for indulgences; such leisure as he had, he preferred devoting to wine-parties with the society and conversation of his officers.

army, from the coast of Syria, over the bridge of the Euphrates, and even through the waters of the Tigris. To them, this must have proved a severe toil; and in fact, the queen Statira became so worn out that she died shortly after crossing the Tigris[1]; to him also, it must have been an onerous obligation, since he not only sought to ensure to them all their accustomed pomp, but must have assigned a considerable guard to watch them, at a moment when he was marching into an unknown country, and required all his military resources to be disposable. Simply for safe detention, the hostages would have been better guarded and might have been treated with still greater ceremony, in a city or a fortress. But Alexander probably wished to have them near him, in case of the possible contingency of serious reverses to his army on the eastern side of the Tigris. Assuming such a misfortune to happen, the surrender of them might ensure a safe retreat under circumstances otherwise fatal to its accomplishment.

Immense army collected by Darius, in the plains eastward of the Tigris —near Arbela.

Being at length convinced that Alexander would not be satisfied with any prize short of the entire Persian empire, Darius summoned all his forces to defend what he still retained. He brought together a host said to be superior in number to that which had been defeated at Issus[2]. Contingents arrived

[1] Curtius, iv. 10, 19. "Itineris continui labore animique ægritudine fatigata," &c.

Curtius and Justin mention a third embassy sent by Darius (immediately after having heard of the death and honourable obsequies of Statira) to Alexander, asking for peace. The other authors allude only to two tentatives of this kind; and the third seems by no means probable.

[2] Arrian, iii. 7, 7.

from the farthest extremities of the vast Persian territory—from the Caspian sea, the rivers Oxus and Indus, the Persian Gulf, and the Red Sea. The plains eastward of the Tigris, about the latitude of the modern town of Mousul, between that river and the Gordyene mountains (Zagros), were fixed upon for the muster of this prodigious multitude; partly conducted by Darius himself from Babylon, partly arriving there by different routes from the north, east, and south. Arbela—a considerable town about twenty miles east of the Great Zab river, still known under the name of Erbil, as a caravan station on the ordinary road between Erzeroum and Bagdad—was fixed on as the muster-place or head-quarters, where the chief magazines were collected and the heavy baggage lodged, and near which the troops were first assembled and exercised[1].

He fixes the spot for encamping and awaiting the attack of Alexander—in a level plain near Gaugamela.

But the spot predetermined for a pitched battle was, the neighbourhood of Gaugamela near the river Bumôdus, about thirty miles west of Arbêla, towards the Tigris, and about as much south-east of Mosul—a spacious and level plain, with nothing more than a few undulating slopes, and without any trees. It was by nature well-adapted for drawing up a numerous army, especially for the free manœuvres of cavalry, and the rush of scythed chariots; moreover, the Persian officers had been careful beforehand to level artificially such of the slopes as they thought inconvenient[2]. There seemed every

[1] Diodorus, xvii. 53; Curtius, iv. 9, 9.

[2] Arrian, iii. 8, 12. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὅσα ἀνώμαλα αὐτοῦ ἐς ἱππασίαν, ταῦτά τε ἐκ πολλοῦ οἱ Πέρσαι τοῖς τε ἅρμασιν ἐπελαύνειν εὐπετῆ πεποιήκεσαν καὶ τῇ ἵππῳ ἱππάσιμα.

thing in the ground to favour the operation both of the vast total, and the special forces, of Darius; who fancied that his defeat at Issus had been occasioned altogether by his having adventured himself in the narrow defiles of Kilikia—and that on open and level ground his superior numbers must be triumphant. He was even anxious that Alexander should come and attack him on the plain. Hence the undefended passage of the Tigris.

His equipment and preparation—better arms—numerous scythed chariots—elephants.

For those who looked only to numbers, the host assembled at Arbêla might well inspire confidence; for it is said to have consisted of 1,000,000 of infantry[1]—40,000 cavalry—200 scythed chariots—and fifteen elephants; of which animals we now read for the first time in a field of battle. But besides the numbers, Darius had provided for his troops more effective arms; instead of mere javelins, strong swords and short thrusting pikes, such as the Macedonian cavalry wielded so admirably in close combat—together with shields for the infantry and breastplates for the horsemen[2]. He counted much also on the terrific charge of the chariots, each of which had a pole projecting before the horses and terminating in a sharp point, together

[1] This is the total given by Arrian as what he found set forth (ἐλέγετο), probably the best information which Ptolemy and Aristobulus could procure (Arrian, iii. 8, 8).

Diodorus (xvii. 53) says 800,000 foot, 200,000 horse, and 200 scythed chariots. Justin (xi. 12) gives 400,000 foot and 100,000 horse. Plutarch (Alex. 31) talks generally of a million of men. Curtius states the army to have been almost twice as large as that which had fought in Kilikia (iv. 9, 3); he gives the total as 200,000 foot, and 45,000 horse (iv. 12, 13).

[2] Diodor. xvii. 53; Curtius, iv. 9, 2.

with three sword-blades stretching from the yoke on each side, and scythes also laterally from the naves of the wheels[1].

B.C. 331, September. Position and battle array of Darius.

Informed of the approach of Alexander, about the time when the Macedonian army first reached the Tigris, Darius moved from Arbela, where his baggage and treasure were left—crossed by bridges the river Lykus or Great Zab, an operation which occupied five days—and marched to take post on the prepared ground near Gaugamela. His battle array was formed—of the Baktrians on the extreme left, under command of Bessus the satrap of Baktria; next, the Dahæ and Arachôti, under command of Barsäentes, satrap of Arachosia; then the native Persians, horse and foot alternating,—the Susians, under Oxathres,—and the Kadusians. On the extreme right were the contingents of Syria both east and west of the Euphrates, under Mazæus; then the Medes, under Atropates; next, the Parthians, Sakæ, Tapyrians, and Hyrkanians, all cavalry, under Phrataphernes; then the Albanians and the Sakesinæ. Darius himself was in the centre, with the choice troops of the army near and around him—the Persian select Horse-guards, called the king's kinsmen—the Persian foot-guards, carrying pikes with a golden apple at the butt-end—a regiment of Karians, or descendants of Karians, who had been abstracted from their homes and planted as colonists in the interior of the empire—

[1] Curtius, iv. 9, 3; Diodor. xvii. 53. Notwithstanding the instructive note of Mützel upon this passage of Curtius, the mode in which these chariots were armed is not clear on all points.

the contingent of Mardi, good archers—and lastly, the mercenary Greeks, of number unknown, in whom Darius placed his greatest confidence.

Such was the first or main line of the Persians. In the rear of it stood deep masses of Babylonians, —inhabitants of Sittakê down to the Persian Gulf —Uxians, from the territory adjoining Susiana to the east—and others in unknown multitude. In front of it were posted the scythed chariots, with small advanced bodies of cavalry—Scythians and Baktrians on the left, with one hundred chariots —Armenians and Kappadokians on the right, with fifty more—and the remaining fifty chariots in front of the centre[1].

B.C. 331, September. Preliminary movements of Alexander—discussions with Parmenio and other officers. His careful reconnoitring in person.

Alexander had advanced within about seven miles of the Persian army; and four days' march since his crossing the Tigris—when he first learnt from Persian prisoners how near his enemies were. He at once halted, established on the spot a camp with ditch and stockade, and remained there for four days, in order that the soldiers might repose. On the night of the fourth day, he moved forward, yet leaving under guard in the camp the baggage, the prisoners, and the ineffectives. He began his

[1] The Persian battle order here given by Arrian (iii. 11), is taken from Aristobulus, who affirmed that it was so set down in the official scheme of the battle, drawn up by the Persian officers, and afterwards captured with the baggage of Darius. Though thus authentic as far as it goes, it is not complete, even as to names—while it says nothing about numbers or depth or extent of front. Several names, of various contingents stated to have been present in the field, are not placed in the official return—thus the Sogdiani, the Arians, and the Indian mountaineers are mentioned by Arrian as having joined Darius (iii. 8); the Kossæans, by Diodorus (xvii. 59); the Sogdiani, Massagetæ, Belitæ, Kossæans, Gortyæ, Phrygians, and Kataonians, by Curtius (iv. 12).

march, over a range of low elevations which divided him from the enemy, hoping to approach and attack them at daybreak. But his progress was so retarded, that day broke, and the two armies first came in sight, when he was still on the descending slope of the ground, more than three miles distant. On seeing the enemy, he halted, and called together his principal officers, to consult whether he should not prosecute his march and commence the attack forthwith[1]. Though most of them pronounced for the affirmative, yet Parmenio contended that this course would be rash; that the ground before them, with all its difficulties, natural or artificial, was unknown, and that the enemy's position, which they now saw for the first time, ought to be carefully reconnoitred. Adopting this latter view, Alexander halted for the day; yet still retaining his battle order, and forming a new entrenched camp, to which the baggage and the prisoners were now brought forward from the preceding day's encampment[2]. He himself spent the day, with an escort of cavalry and light troops, in re-

[1] Arrian, iii. 9, 5–7.

[2] Arrian, iii. 9, 2–8. It is not expressly mentioned by Arrian that the baggage, &c. was brought forward from the first camp to the second. But we see that such must have been the fact, from what happened during the battle. Alexander's baggage, which was plundered by a body of Persian cavalry, cannot have been so far in the rear of the army as the distance of the first camp would require. This coincides also with Curtius, iv. 13, 35. The words ἔγνω ἀπολείπειν (Arr. iii. 9, 2), indicate the contemplation of a purpose which was not accomplished—ὡς ἅμ' ἡμέρᾳ προσμίξαι τοῖς πολεμίοις (iii. 9, 3). Instead of "coming into conflict" with the enemy at break of day—Alexander only arrived within sight of them at break of day; he then halted the whole day and night within sight of their position; and naturally brought up his baggage, having no motive to leave it so far in the rear.

connoitring both the intermediate ground and the enemy, who did not interrupt him, in spite of their immense superiority in cavalry. Parmenio, with Polysperchon and others, advised him to attack the enemy in the night; which promised some advantages, since Persian armies were notoriously unmanageable by night[1], and since their camp had no defence. But on the other hand, the plan involved so many disadvantages and perils, that Alexander rejected it; declaring—with an emphasis intentionally enhanced, since he spoke in the hearing of many others—that he disdained the meanness of stealing a victory; that he both would conquer, and could conquer, Darius fairly and in open daylight[2]. Having then addressed to his officers a few brief encouragements, which met with enthusiastic response, he dismissed them to their evening meal and repose.

Dispositions of Alexander for the attack—array of the troops.

On the next morning, he marshalled his army, consisting of 40,000 foot, and 7000 horse, in two lines[3]. The first or main line was composed, on the right, of the eight squadrons of Companion-cavalry, each with its separate captain, but all under the command of Philôtas son of Parmenio. Next (proceeding from right to left) came the Agêma or chosen band of the Hypaspistæ—then the remaining Hypaspistæ, under Nikanor—then the phalanx properly so called, distributed into six divisions, under the command of Kœnus, Perdikkas, Meleager, Polysperchon, Simmias, and Kraterus, respectively[4]. Next on the left of the pha-

[1] Xenoph. Anabas. iii. 4, 35.
[2] Arrian, iii. 10, 3; Curtius, iv. 13, 4–10. [3] Arrian, iii. 12, 1–9.
[4] Arrian, iii. 11; Diodor. xvii. 57; Curtius, iv. 13, 26–30.

lanx, were ranged the allied Grecian cavalry, Lokrian and Phokian, Phthiot, Malians, and Peloponnesians; after whom, at the extreme left, came the Thessalians under Philippus—among the best cavalry in the army, hardly inferior to the Macedonian Companions. As in the two former battles, Alexander himself took the command of the right half of the army, confiding the left to Parmenio.

Behind this main line, was placed a second or body of reserve, intended to guard against attacks in the flanks and rear, which the superior numbers of the Persians rendered probable. For this purpose, Alexander reserved,—on the right, the light cavalry or Lancers—the Pæonians, under Aretes and Aristo—half the Agrianes, under Attalus—the Macedonian archers, under Brison—and the mercenaries of old service, under Kleander; on the left, various bodies of Thracian and allied cavalry, under their separate officers. All these different regiments were held ready to repel attack either in flank or rear. In front of the main line were some advanced squadrons of cavalry and light troops—Grecian cavalry, under Menidas on the right, and under Andromachus on the left—a brigade of darters under Balakrus, together with Agrianian darters, and some bowmen. Lastly, the Thracian infantry were left to guard the camp and the baggage[1].

Battle of Arbela.

Forewarned by a deserter, Alexander avoided the places where iron spikes had been planted to damage the Macedonian cavalry[2]. He himself, at

[1] Arrian, iii. 12, 2-6; Curtius, iv. 13, 30-32; Diodor. xvii. 57.
[2] Curtius, iv. 13, 36; Polyænus, iv. 3, 17.

the head of the Royal Squadron, on the extreme right, led the march obliquely in that direction, keeping his right somewhat in advance. As he neared the enemy, he saw Darius himself with the Persian left centre immediately opposed to him—Persian guards, Indians, Albanians, and Karians. Alexander went on inclining to the right, and Darius stretching his front towards the left to counteract this movement, but still greatly outflanking the Macedonians to the left. Alexander had now got so far to his right, that he was almost beyond the ground levelled by Darius for the operations of his chariots in front. To check any farther movement in this direction, the Baktrian 1000 horse and the Scythians in front of the Persian left, were ordered to make a circuit and attack the Macedonian right flank. Alexander detached against them his regiment of cavalry under Menidas, and the action thus began[1].

The Baktrian horse, perceiving the advance of Menidas, turned from their circuitous movement to attack him, and at first drove him back until he was supported by the other advanced detachments —Pæonians and Grecian cavalry. The Baktrians, defeated in their turn, were supported by the satrap Bessus with the main body of Baktrians and Scythians in the left portion of Darius's line. The action was here for some time warmly contested, with some loss to the Greeks; who at length however, by a more compact order against enemies whose fighting was broken and desultory, succeeded

[1] Arrian, iii. 13, 1-5.

in pushing them out of their place in the line, and thus making a partial opening in it[1].

While this conflict was still going on, Darius had ordered his scythed chariots to charge, and his main line to follow them, calculating on the disorder which he expected that they would occasion. But the chariots were found of little service. The horses were terrified, checked, or wounded, by the Macedonian archers and darters in front; who even found means to seize the reins, pull down the drivers, and kill the horses. Of the hundred chariots in Darius's front, intended to bear down the Macedonian ranks by simultaneous pressure along their whole line, many were altogether stopped or disabled; some turned right round, the horses refusing to face the protended pikes, or being scared with the noise of pike and shield struck together; some which reached the Macedonian line, were let through without mischief by the soldiers opening their ranks; a few only inflicted wounds or damage[2].

As soon as the chariots were thus disposed of, and

[1] Arrian, iii. 13, 9.

[2] About the chariots, Arrian, iii. 13, 11; Curtius, iv. 15, 14; Diodor. xvii. 57, 58.

Arrian mentions distinctly only those chariots which were launched on Darius's left, immediately opposite to Alexander. But it is plain that the chariots along the whole line must have been let off at one and the same signal—which we may understand as implied in the words of Curtius—"Ipse (Darius) ante se falcatos currus habebat, quos signo dato universos in hostem effudit" (iv. 14, 3).

The scythed chariots of Artaxerxes, at the battle of Kunaxa, did no mischief (Xenoph. Anab. i. 8, 10-20). At the battle of Magnesia, gained by the Romans (B.C. 190) over the Syrian king Antiochus, his chariots were not only driven back, but spread disorder among their own troops (Appian. Reb. Syriac. 33).

the Persian main force laid open as advancing behind them, Alexander gave orders to the troops of his main line, who had hitherto been perfectly silent[1], to raise the war-shout and charge at a quick pace; at the same time directing Aretes with the Pæonians to repel the assailants on his right flank. He himself, discontinuing his slanting movement to the right, turned towards the Persian line, and dashed, at the head of all the Companion-cavalry, into that partial opening in it, which had been made by the flank movement of the Baktrians. Having by this opening got partly within the line, he pushed straight towards the person of Darius; his cavalry engaging in the closest hand-combat, and thrusting with their short pikes at the faces of the Persians. Here, as at the Granikus, the latter were discomposed by this mode of fighting—accustomed as they were to rely on the use of missiles, with rapid wheeling of the horse for renewed attack[2]. They were unable to prevent Alexander and his cavalry from gaining ground and approaching nearer to Darius; while at the same time, the Macedonian phalanx in front, with its compact order and long protended pikes, pressed upon the Persian line opposed to it. For a short interval, the combat here was close and obstinate; and it might have been much prolonged—since the best troops of Darius's

Cowardice of Darius—he sets the example of flight—defeat of the Persians.

[1] See the remarkable passage in the address of Alexander to his soldiers, previous to the battle, about the necessity of absolute silence until the moment came for the terrific war-shout (Arrian, iii. 9, 14): compare Thucyd. ii. 89—a similar direction from Phormio to the Athenians.

[2] Arrian, iii. 15, 4. οὔτε ἀκοντισμῷ ἔτι, οὔτε ἐξελιγμοῖς τῶν ἵππων, ἥπερ ἱππομαχίας δίκη, ἐχρῶντο—about the Persian cavalry when driven to despair.

army—Greeks, Karians, Persian guards, regal kinsmen, &c., were here posted,—had the king's courage been equal to that of his soldiers. But here, even worse than at Issus, the flight of the army began with Darius himself. It had been the recommendation of Cyrus the younger, in attacking the army of his brother Artaxerxes at Kunaxa, to aim the main blow at the spot where his brother was in person—since he well knew that victory there was victory everywhere. Having already once followed this scheme successfully at Issus, Alexander repeated it with still more signal success at Arbela. Darius, who had been long in fear, from the time when he first beheld his formidable enemy on the neighbouring hills, became still more alarmed when he saw the scythed chariots prove a failure, and when the Macedonians, suddenly breaking out from absolute silence into an universal war-cry, came to close quarters with his troops, pressing towards and menacing the conspicuous chariot on which he stood[1]. The sight and hearing of this terrific *mêlée*, combined with the prestige already attaching to Alexander's name, completely overthrew the courage and self-possession of Darius. He caused his chariot to be turned round, and himself set the example of flight[2].

[1] Arrian, iii. 14, 2. ἦγε δρόμῳ τε καὶ ἀλαλαγμῷ ὡς ἐπὶ αὐτὸν Δαρεῖον —Diodor. xvii. 60. Alexander μετὰ τῆς βασιλικῆς ἴλης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἱππέων ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἤλαυνε τὸν Δαρεῖον.

[2] Arrian, iii. 14, 3. Καὶ χρόνον μέν τινα ὀλιγον ἐν χερσὶν ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο. Ὡς δὲ οἵ τε ἱππεῖς οἱ ἀμφ' Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀλέξανδρος εὐρώστως ἐνέκειντο, ὠθισμοῖς τε χρώμενοι, καὶ τοῖς ξυστοῖς τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν Περσῶν κύπτοντες, ἥ τε φάλαγξ ἡ Μακεδονικὴ, πυκνὴ καὶ ταῖς σαρίσσαις πεφρικυῖα, ἐμβέβληκεν ἤδη αὐτοῖς, καὶ πάντα ὁμοῦ τὰ δεινὰ καὶ πάλαι ἤδη φοβερῷ ὄντι Δαρείῳ ἐφαίνετο, πρῶτος αὐτὸς

From this moment, the battle, though it had lasted so short a time, was irreparably lost. The king's flight, followed of course immediately by that of the numerous attendants around him, spread dismay among all his troops, leaving them neither centre of command, nor chief to fight for. The best soldiers in his army, being those immediately around him, were under these circumstances the first to give way. The fierce onset of Alexander with the Companion-cavalry, and the unremitting pressure of the phalanx in front, was obstructed by little else than a mass of disordered fugitives. During the same time, Aretes with his Pæonians had defeated the Baktrians on the right flank[1], so that Alexander was free to pursue the routed main body,—which he did most energetically. The cloud of dust raised by the dense multitude is said to have been so thick, that nothing could be clearly seen, nor could the pursuers distinguish the track taken by Darius

ἐπιστρέψας ἔφευγεν. At Issus, Arrian states that "Darius fled along with the first" (ii. 11, 6); at Arbela here, he states that "Darius was the first to turn and flee;" an expression yet stronger and more distinct. Curtius and Diodorus, who seem here as elsewhere to follow generally the same authorities, give details, respecting the conduct of Darius, which are not to be reconciled with Arrian, and which are decidedly less credible than Arrian's narrative. The fact that the two kings were here (as at Issus) near, and probably visible, to each other, has served as a basis for much embroidery. The statement that Darius, standing on his chariot, hurled his spear against the advancing Macedonians—and that Alexander also hurled his spear at Darius, but missing him, killed the charioteer—is picturesque and Homeric, but has no air of reality. Curtius and Diodorus tell us that this fall of the charioteer was mistaken for the fall of the king, and struck the Persian army with consternation, causing them forthwith to take flight, and thus ultimately forcing Darius to flee also (Diodor. xvii. 60; Curt. iv. 15, 26–32). But this is noway probable; since the real fight then going on was close, and with hand-weapons.

[1] Arrian, iii. 14, 4.

himself. Amidst this darkness, the cries and noises from all sides were only the more impressive; especially the sound from the whips of the charioteers, pushing their horses to full speed[1]. It was the dust alone which saved Darius himself from being overtaken by the pursuing cavalry.

Combat on the Persian right between Mazæus and Parmenio.

While Alexander was thus fully successful on his right and centre, the scene on his left under Parmenio was different. Mazæus, who commanded the Persian right, after launching his scythed chariots (which may possibly have done more damage than those launched on the Persian left, though we have no direct information about them), followed it up by vigorously charging the Grecian and Thessalian horse in his front, and also by sending round a detachment of cavalry to attack them on their left flank[2]. Here the battle was obstinately contested, and success for some time doubtful. Even after the flight of Darius, Parmenio found himself so much pressed, that he sent a message to Alexander. Alexander, though full of mortification at relinquishing the pursuit, checked his troops, and brought them back to the assistance of his left, by the shortest course across the field of battle. The two left divisions of the phalanx, under Simmias and Kraterus, had already stopped short in the pursuit, on receiving the like message from Parmenio; leaving the other four divisions to follow the advanced move-

[1] Diodor. xvii. 60; Curtius, iv. 15, 32, 33. The cloud of dust, and the noise of the whips, are specified both by Diodorus and Curtius.

[2] Curtius, iv. 16, 1; Diodorus, xvii. 59, 60; Arrian, iii. 14, 11. The two first authors are here superior to Arrian, who scarcely mentions at all this vigorous charge of Mazæus, though he alludes to the effects produced by it.

ment of Alexander[1]. Hence there arose a gap in the midst of the phalanx, between the four right divisions, and the two left; into which gap a brigade of Indian and Persian cavalry darted, galloping through the midst of the Macedonian line to get into the rear and attack the baggage[2]. At first this movement was successful, the guard was found unprepared, and the Persian prisoners rose at once to set themselves free; though Sisygambis, whom these prisoners were above measure anxious to liberate, refused to accept their aid, either from mistrust of their force, or gratitude for the good treatment received from Alexander[3]. But while these assailants were engaged in plundering the baggage, they were attacked in the rear by the troops forming the second Macedonian line, who though at first taken by surprise, had now had time to face about and reach the camp. Many of the Persian brigade were thus slain, the rest got off as they could[4].

[1] Arrian, iii. 14, 6. He speaks directly here only of the τάξις under the command of Simmias; but it is plain that what he says must be understood of the τάξις commanded by Krateros also. Of the six τάξεις or divisions of the phalanx, that of Krateros stood at the extreme left—that of Simmias (who commanded on this day the τάξις of Amyntas son of Andromenes) next to it (iii. 11, 16). If therefore the τάξις of Simmias was kept back from pursuit, on account of the pressure upon the general Macedonian left (iii. 14, 6)—*à fortiori*, the τάξις of Krateros must have been kept back in like manner.

[2] Arrian, iii. 14, 7.

[3] Curtius, iv. 15, 9–11; Diodor. xvii. 59. Curtius and Diodorus represent the brigade of cavalry, who plundered the camp and rescued the prisoners, to have been sent round by Mazæus from the Persian right; while Arrian states, more probably, that they got through the break accidentally left in the phalanx, and traversed the Macedonian lines.

[4] Arrian, iii. 14, 10. Curtius represents this brigade as having been driven off by Aretes and a detachment sent expressly by Alexander himself. Diodorus describes it as if it had not been defeated at all, but

Mazæus maintained for a certain time fair equality, on his own side of the battle, even after the flight of Darius. But when, to the paralysing effect of that fact in itself, there was added the spectacle of its disastrous effects on the left half of the Persian army, neither he nor his soldiers could persevere with unabated vigour in a useless combat. The Thessalian and Grecian horse, on the other hand, animated by the turn of fortune in their favour, pressed their enemies with redoubled energy and at length drove them to flight; so that Parmenio was victor, on his own side and with his own forces, before the succours from Alexander reached him[1].

In conducting those succours, on his way back from the pursuit, Alexander traversed the whole field of battle, and thus met face to face some of the best Persian and Parthian cavalry, who were among the last to retire. The battle was already lost, and they were seeking only to escape. As they could not turn back, and had no chance for their lives except by forcing their way through his Companion-cavalry, the combat here was desperate and murderous; all at close quarters, cut and thrust with hand weapons on both sides contrary to the Persian custom. Sixty of the Macedonian cavalry were slain; and a still greater number, including

had ridden back to Mazæus after plundering the baggage. Neither of these accounts is so probable as that of Arrian.

[1] Diodor. xvii. 60. Ὁ Παρμενίων.....μόλις ἐτρέψατο τοὺς βαρβάρους, μάλιστα καταπλαγέντας τῇ κατὰ τὸν Δαρεῖον φυγῇ. Curtius, iv. 16, 4-7. "Interim ad Mazæum fama superati regis pervenerat. Itaque, quanquam validior erat, tamen fortunâ partium territus, perculsis languidius instabat." Arrian, iv. 14, 11; iv. 15, 8.

Hephæstion, Kœnus, and Menidas, were wounded, and Alexander himself encountered great personal danger. He is said to have been victorious; yet probably most of these brave men forced their way through and escaped, though leaving many of their number on the field[1].

Flight of the Persian host—energetic pursuit by Alexander.

Having rejoined his left, and ascertained that it was not only out of danger, but victorious, Alexander resumed his pursuit of the flying Persians, in which Parmenio now took part[2]. The host of Darius was only a multitude of disorderly fugitives, horse and foot mingled together. The greater part of them had taken no share in the battle. Here, as at Issus, they remained crowded in stationary and unprofitable masses, ready to catch the contagion of terror and to swell the number of runaways, so soon as the comparatively small proportion of real combatants in the front had been beaten. On recommencing the pursuit, Alexander pushed forward with such celerity, that numbers of the fugitives were slain or taken, especially at the passage of the river Lykus[3]; where he was obliged to halt for a while, since his men as well as their horses were exhausted. At midnight, he again pushed forward, with such cavalry as could follow him, to Arbela, in hopes of capturing the person of Darius. In this he was disappointed, though he reached Arbela

[1] Arrian, iii. 15, 6. Curtius also alludes to this combat; but with many particulars very different from Arrian (iv. 16, 19-25).

[2] Arrian, iii. 15, 9.

[3] Arrian, iii. 15, 10. Curtius (iv. 16, 12-18) gives aggravated details about the sufferings of the fugitives in passing the river Lykus—which are probably founded on fact. But he makes the mistake of supposing that Alexander had got as far as this river in his first pursuit, from which he was called back to assist Parmenio.

Escape of Darius in person. Capture of the Persian camp, and of Arbela.

the next day. Darius had merely passed through it, leaving an undefended town, with his bow, shield, chariot, a large treasure, and rich equipage, as prey to the victor. Parmenio had also occupied without resistance the Persian camp near the field of battle, capturing the baggage, the camels, and the elephants[1].

Loss in the battle. Completeness of the victory. Entire and irreparable dispersion of the Persian army.

To state any thing like positive numbers of slain or prisoners, is impossible. According to Arrian, 300,000 Persians were slain, and many more taken prisoners. Diodorus puts the slain at 90,000, Curtius at 40,000. The Macedonian killed were, according to Arrian, not more than 100—according to Curtius, 300: Diodorus states the slain at 500, besides a great number of wounded[2]. The estimate of Arrian is obviously too great on one side, and too small on the other; but whatever may be the numerical truth, it is certain that the prodigious army of Darius was all either killed, taken, or dispersed, at the battle of Arbela. No attempt to form a subsequent army ever succeeded; we read of nothing stronger than divisions or detachments. The miscellaneous contingents of this once mighty empire, such at least among them as survived, dispersed to their respective homes and could never be again mustered in mass.

Causes of the defeat —cowardice of Darius. Uselessness of his immense numbers.

The defeat of Arbela was in fact the death blow of the Persian empire. It converted Alexander into the Great King, and Darius into nothing better than a fugitive pretender. Among all the causes of the defeat—here as at Issus—the most prominent and

[1] Arrian, iii. 15, 14; Curtius, v. 1, 10.

[2] Arrian, iii. 15, 16; Curtius, iv. 16, 27; Diodor. xvii. 61.

indisputable was the cowardice of Darius himself. Under a king deficient not merely in the virtues of a general, but even in those of a private soldier, and who nevertheless insisted on commanding in person—nothing short of ruin could ensue. To those brave Persians whom he dragged into ruin along with him and who knew the real facts, he must have appeared as the betrayer of the empire. We shall have to recall this state of sentiment, when we describe hereafter the conspiracy formed by the Baktrian satrap Bessus. Nevertheless, even if Darius had behaved with unimpeachable courage, there is little reason to believe, that the defeat of Arbela, much less that of Issus, could have been converted into a victory. Mere immensity of number, even with immensity of space, was of no efficacy without skill as well as bravery in the commander. Three-fourths of the Persian army were mere spectators, who did nothing, and produced absolutely no effect. The flank movement against Alexander's right, instead of being made by some unemployed division, was so carried into effect, as to distract the Baktrian troops from their place in the front line, and thus to create a fatal break, of which Alexander availed himself for his own formidable charge in front. In spite of amplitude of space—the condition wanting at Issus,—the attacks of the Persians on Alexander's flanks and rear were feeble and inefficient. After all, Darius relied mainly upon his front line of battle, strengthened by the scythed chariots; these latter being found unprofitable, there remained only the direct conflict, wherein the strong point of the Macedonians resided.

Generalship of Alexander.

On the other hand, in so far as we can follow the dispositions of Alexander, they appear the most signal example recorded in antiquity, of military genius and sagacious combination. He had really as great an available force as his enemies, because every company in his army was turned to account, either in actual combat, or in reserve against definite and reasonable contingences. All his successes, and this most of all, were fairly earned by his own genius and indefatigable effort, combined with the admirable organization of his army. But his good fortune was no less conspicuous in the unceasing faults committed by his enemies. Except during the short period of Memnon's command, the Persian king exhibited nothing but ignorant rashness alternating with disgraceful apathy; turning to no account his vast real power of resistance in detail—keeping back his treasures to become the booty of the victor—suffering the cities which stoutly held out to perish unassisted—and committing the whole fate of the empire, on two successive occasions, to that very hazard which Alexander most desired.

B.C. 331, Oct.–Nov. Surrender of Babylon and Susa, the two great capitals of Persia. Alexander enters Babylon. Immense treasures acquired in both places.

The decisive character of the victory was manifested at once by the surrender of the two great capitals of the Persian empire—Babylon and Susa. To Babylon, Alexander marched in person; to Susa, he sent Philoxenus. As he approached Babylon, the satrap Mazæus met him with the keys of the city; Bagophanes, collector of the revenue, decorated the road of march with altars, sacrifices, and scattered flowers; while the general Babylonian population and their Chaldæan priests poured forth in crowds with acclamations and pre-

sents. Susa was yielded to Philoxenus with the same readiness, as Babylon to Alexander[1]. The sum of treasure acquired at Babylon was great: sufficient to furnish a large donative to the troops —600 drachms per man to the Macedonian cavalry, 500 to the foreign cavalry, 200 to the Macedonian infantry, and something less to the foreign infantry[2]. But the treasure found and appropriated at Susa was yet greater. It is stated at 50,000 talents[3] (= about £11,500,000 sterling), a sum which we might have deemed incredible, if we did not find it greatly exceeded by what is subsequently reported about the treasures in Persepolis. Of this Susian treasure four-fifths are said to have been in uncoined gold and silver, the remainder in golden Darics[4]; the untouched accumulations of several preceding kings, who had husbanded them against a season of unforeseen urgency. A moderate portion of this immense wealth, employed by Darius three years earlier to push the operations of his fleet, subsidize able Grecian officers, and organize anti-Macedonian resistance—would have preserved both his life and his crown.

B.C. 331, November, December.

Alexander rested his troops for more than thirty days amidst the luxurious indulgences of Babylon. He gratified the feelings of the population and the Chaldæan priests by solemn sacrifices to Belus, as well as by directing that the temple of that God,

Alexander acts as king of Persia, and nominates satraps. He marches to Susa. He remodels the divisions of his army.

[1] Arrian, iii. 16, 5–11; Diodor. xvii. 64; Curtius, v. 1, 17–20.

[2] Curtius, v. 1, 45; Diodor. xvii. 64.

[3] Arrian states this total of 50,000 talents (iii. 16, 12).

I have taken them as Attic talents; if they were Æginæan talents, the value of them would be greater in the proportion of five to three.

[4] Curtius, v. 2, 11; Diodor. xvii. 66.

,and the other temples destroyed in the preceding century by Xerxes, should be rebuilt[1]. Treating the Persian empire now as an established conquest, he nominated the various satraps. He confirmed the Persian Mazæus in the satrapy of Babylon, but put along with him two Greeks as assistants and guarantees—Apollodorus of Amphipolis, as commander of the military force—Asklepiodorus as collector of the revenue. He rewarded the Persian traitor Mithrines, who had surrendered at his approach the strong citadel of Sardis, with the satrapy of Armenia. To that of Syria and Phenicia, he appointed Menes, who took with him 3000 talents, to be remitted to Antipater for levying new troops against the Lacedæmonians in Peloponnesus[2]. The march of Alexander from Babylon to Susa occupied twenty days; an easy route through a country abundantly supplied. At Susa he was joined by Amyntas son of Andromenes, with a large reinforcement of about 15,000 men—Macedonians, Greeks, and Thracians. There were both cavalry and infantry—and what is not the least remarkable, fifty Macedonian youths of noble family, soliciting admission into Alexander's corps of pages[3]. The incorporation of these new-comers into the army afforded him the opportunity for remodelling on several points the organization of his different divisions, the smaller as well as the larger[4].

[1] Arrian, iii. 16, 6–9: compare Strabo, xvi. p. 738.

[2] Arrian, iii. 16, 16; Curtius, v. 1, 44; Diodor. xvii. 64. Curtius and Diodorus do not exactly coincide with Arrian; but the discrepancy here is not very important.

[3] Curtius, v. 1, 42: compare Diodor. xvii. 65; Arrian, iii. 16, 18.

[4] Arrian, iii. 16, 20; Curtius, v. 2, 6; Diodor. xvii. 65. Respecting

B.C. 331–330, winter.

Alexander marches into Persis proper—he conquers the refractory Uxii, in the intermediate mountains.

After some delay at Susa—and after confirming the Persian Abulites, who had surrendered the city, in his satrapy, yet not without two Grecian officers as guarantees, one commanding the military force, the other governor of the citadel—Alexander crossed the river Eulæus or Pasitigris, and directed his march to the south-east towards Persis proper, the ancient hearth or primitive seat from whence the original Persian conquerors had issued[1]. Between Susa and Persis lay a mountainous region occupied by the Uxii—rude but warlike shepherds, to whom the Great King himself had always been obliged to pay a tribute whenever he went from Susa to Persepolis, being unable with his inefficient military organization to overcome the difficulties of such a pass held by an enemy. The Uxii now demanded the like tribute from Alexander, who replied by inviting them to meet him at their pass and receive it. Meanwhile a new and little frequented mountain

this re-organization, begun now at Susa and carried farther during the next year at Ekbatana, see Rüstow and Köchly, Griechisches Kriegswesen, p. 252 *seq.*

One among the changes now made was, that the divisions of cavalry —which, having hitherto coincided with various local districts or towns in Macedonia, had been officered accordingly—were re-distributed and mingled together (Curtius, v. 2, 6).

[1] Arrian, iii. 17, 1. Ἄρας δὲ ἐκ Σούσων, καὶ διαβὰς τὸν Πασιτίγρην ποταμὸν, ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὴν Οὐξίων γῆν.

The Persian Susa was situated between two rivers; the Choaspes (now Kherkha) on the west; the Eulæus or Pasitigris, now Karun, on the east; both rivers distinguished for excellent water. The Eulæus appears to have been called Pasitigris in the lower part of its course—Pliny, H. N. xxxi. 21. "Parthorum reges ex Choaspe et Eulæo tantum bibunt."

Ritter has given an elaborate exposition respecting these two rivers and the site of the Persian Susa (Erdkunde, part ix. book iii. West-Asien, p. 291–320.

track had been made known to him, over which he conducted in person a detachment of troops so rapidly and secretly as to surprise the mountaineers in their own villages. He thus not only opened the usual mountain pass for the transit of his main army, but so cut to pieces and humiliated the Uxii, that they were forced to sue for pardon. Alexander was at first disposed to extirpate or expel them; but at length, at the request of the captive Sisygambis, permitted them to remain as subjects of the satrap of Susa, imposing a tribute of sheep, horses, and cattle, the only payment which their poverty allowed[1].

Difficult pass called the Susian Gates, on the way to Persepolis. Ariobarzanes the satrap repulses Alexander, who finds means to turn the pass, and conquer it.

But bad as the Uxian pass had been, there remained another still worse—called the Susian or Persian gates[2], in the mountains which surrounded the plain of Persepolis, the centre of Persis proper. Ariobarzanes, satrap of the province, held this pass; a narrow defile walled across, with mountain positions on both sides, from whence the defenders, while out of reach themselves, could shower down missiles upon an approaching enemy. After four

[1] Arrian, iii. 17; Curtius, v. 3, 5-12; Diodor. xvii. 67; Strabo, xv. p. 729. It would seem that the road taken by Alexander in this march, was that described by Kinneir, through Behahan and Kala-Sefid to Schiraz (Geographical Memoir of the Persian Empire, p. 72). Nothing can exceed the difficulties of the territory for military operation.

No certainty is attainable, however, respecting the ancient geography of these regions. Mr. Long's Map of Ancient Persia shows how little can be made out.

[2] See the instructive notes of Mützel—on Quintus Curtius, v. 10, 3; and v. 12, 17, discussing the topography of this region, in so far as it is known from modern travellers. He supposes the Susian Gates to have been near Kala-Sefid, west of the plain of Merdasht or Persepolis. Herein he dissents from Ritter, apparently on good grounds, as far as an opinion can be formed.

days of march, Alexander reached on the fifth day the Susian Gates; which, inexpugnable as they seemed, he attacked on the ensuing morning. In spite of all the courage of his soldiers, however, he sustained loss without damaging his enemy, and was obliged to return to his camp. He was informed that there was no other track by which this difficult pass could be turned; but there was a long circuitous march of many days whereby it might be evaded, and another entrance found into the plain of Persepolis. To recede from any enterprise as impracticable, was a humiliation which Alexander had never yet endured. On farther inquiry, a Lykian captive, who had been for many years tending sheep as a slave on the mountains, acquainted him with the existence of a track known only to himself, whereby he might come on the flank of Ariobarzanes. Leaving Kraterus in command of the camp, with orders to attack the pass in front, when he should hear the trumpet give signal—Alexander marched forth at night at the head of a light detachment, under the guidance of the Lykian. He had to surmount incredible hardship and difficulty—the more so as it was midwinter, and the mountain was covered with snow; yet such were the efforts of his soldiers and the rapidity of his movements, that he surprised all the Persian outposts, and came upon Ariobarzanes altogether unprepared. Attacked as they were at the same time by Kraterus also, the troops of the satrap were forced to abandon the Gates, and were for the most part cut to pieces. Many perished in their flight among the rocks and pre-

cipices; the satrap himself being one of a few that escaped[1].

Alexander enters Persepolis.

Though the citadel of Persepolis is described as one of the strongest of fortresses[2], yet after this unexpected conquest of a pass hitherto deemed inexpugnable, few had courage to think of holding it against Alexander. Nevertheless Ariobarzanes, hastening thither from the conquered pass, still strove to organise a defence, and at least to carry off the regal treasure, which some in the town were already preparing to pillage. But Tiridates, commander of the garrison, fearing the wrath of the conqueror, resisted this, and despatched a message entreating Alexander to hasten his march. Accordingly Alexander, at the head of his cavalry, set forth with the utmost speed, and arrived in time to detain and appropriate the whole. Ariobarzanes, in a vain attempt to resist, was slain with all his companions. Persepolis and Pasargadæ—the two peculiar capitals of the Persian race, the latter memorable as containing the sepulchre of Cyrus the Great—both fell into the hands of the conqueror[3].

B.C. 330, January.

Mutilated Grecian captives.

On approaching Persepolis, the compassion of the army was powerfully moved by the sight of about 800 Grecian captives, all of them mutilated in some frightful and distressing way, by loss of legs, arms, eyes, ears, or some other bodily members. Mutilation was a punishment commonly inflicted in that age by Oriental governors, even by such as were not accounted cruel. Thus Xeno-

[1] Arrian, iii. 18, 1-14; Curtius, v. 4, 10-20; Diodor. xvii. 68.
[2] Diodor. xvii. 71.
[3] Arrian, iii. 18, 16; Curtius, v. 4, 5; Diodor. xvii. 69.

phon, in eulogizing the rigid justice of Cyrus the younger, remarks that in the public roads of his satrapy, men were often seen who had been deprived of their arms or legs, or otherwise mutilated, by penal authority[1]. Many of these maimed captives at Persepolis were old, and had lived for years in their unfortunate condition. They had been brought up from various Greek cities by order of some of the preceding Persian kings; but on what pretences they had been thus cruelly dealt with, we are not informed. Alexander, moved to tears at such a spectacle, offered to restore them to their respective homes, with a comfortable provision for the future. But most of them felt so ashamed of returning to their homes, that they entreated to be allowed to remain all together in Persis, with lands assigned to them, and with dependent cultivators to raise produce for them. Alexander granted their request in the fullest measure, conferring besides upon each an ample donation of money, clothing, and cattle[2].

[1] Xenoph. Anabas. i. 9, 13. Similar habits have always prevailed among Orientals. "The most atrocious part of the Mahomedan system of punishment, is, that which regards theft and robbery. Mutilation, by cutting off the hand or the foot, is the prescribed remedy for all higher degrees of the offence" (Mill, History of British India, book iii. ch. 5. p. 447).

"Tippoo Saib used to cut off the right hands and noses of the British camp-followers that fell into his hands" (Elphinstone, Hist. of India, vol. i. p. 380. ch. xi.).

A recent traveller notices the many mutilated persons, female as well as male, who are to be seen in the northern part of Scinde (Burton, Scenes in Scinde, vol. ii. p. 281).

[2] Diodor. xvii. 69; Curtius, v. 5; Justin, xi. 14. Arrian does not mention these mutilated captives; but I see no reason to mistrust the deposition of the three authors by whom it is certified. Curtius talks of 4000 captives; the other two mention 800. Diodorus calls them—

Immense wealth, and national monuments of every sort, accumulated in Persepolis.

The sight of these mutilated Greeks was well calculated to excite not merely sympathy for them, but rage against the Persians, in the bosoms of all spectators. Alexander seized this opportunity, as well for satiating the anger and cupidity of his soldiers, as for manifesting himself in his self-assumed character of avenger of Greece against the Persians, to punish the wrongs done by Xerxes a century and a half before. He was now amidst the native tribes and seats of the Persians, the descendants of those rude warriors who, under the first Cyrus, had overspread Western Asia from the Indus to the Ægean. In this their home the Persian kings had accumulated their national edifices, their regal sepulchres, the inscriptions commemorative of their religious or legendary sentiment, with many trophies and acquisitions arising out of their conquests. For the purposes of the Great King's empire, Babylon, or Susa, or Ekbatana, were more central and convenient residences; but Persepolis was still regarded as the heart of Persian nationality. It was the chief magazine, though not the only one, of those annual

"Ελληνες ὑπὸ τῶν πρότερον βασιλέων ἀνάστατοι γεγονότες, ὀκτακόσιοι μὲν σχεδὸν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὄντες, ταῖς δ' ἡλικίαις οἱ πλεῖστοι μὲν γεγηρακότες, ἠκρωτηριασμένοι δε πάντες, &c. Some ἀνάρπαστοι πρὸς βασιλέα διὰ σοφίαν are noticed in Xenoph. Mem. iv. 2, 33: compare Herodot. iii. 93; iv. 204. I have already mentioned the mutilation of the Macedonian invalids, taken at Issus by Darius.

Probably these Greek captives were mingled with a number of other captives, Asiatics and others, who had been treated in the same manner. None but the Greek captives would be likely to show themselves to Alexander and his army, because none but they would calculate on obtaining sympathy from an army of Macedonians and Greeks. It would have been interesting to know who these captives were, or how they came to be thus cruelly used. The two persons among them, named by Curtius as spokesmen in the interview with Alexander, are—Euktemon, a Kymæan—and Theætêtus, an Athenian.

accumulations from the imperial revenue, which each king successively increased, and which none seems to have ever diminished. Moreover, the Persian grandees and officers, who held the lucrative satrapies and posts of the empire, were continually sending wealth home to Persis, for themselves or their relatives. We may therefore reasonably believe what we find asserted, that Persepolis possessed at this time more wealth, public and private, than any place within the range of Grecian or Macedonian knowledge[1].

Alexander appropriates and carries away the regal treasures, and then gives up Persepolis to be plundered and burnt by the soldiers.

Convening his principal officers, Alexander denounced Persepolis as the most hostile of all Asiatic cities,—the home of those impious invaders of Greece, whom he had come to attack. He proclaimed his intention of abandoning it to be plundered, as well as of burning the citadel. In this resolution he persisted, notwithstanding the remonstrance of Parmenio, who reminded him that the act would be a mere injury to himself by ruining his own property, and that the Asiatics would construe it as evidence of an intention to retire speedily, without founding any permanent dominion in the country[2]. After appropriating the regal treasure—to the alleged amount of 120,000 talents in gold and silver = £27,600,000 sterling[3] — Alexander

[1] Diodor. xvii. 70. πλουσιωτάτης οὔσης τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον, &c. Curtius, v. 6, 2, 3.

[2] Arrian, iii. 18, 18; Diodor. xvii. 70; Curtius, v. 6, 1; Strabo, xv. p. 731.

[3] This amount is given both by Diodorus (xvii. 71) and by Curtius (v. 6, 9). We see however from Strabo that there were different statements as to the amount. Such overwhelming figures deserve no confidence upon any evidence short of an official return. At the same time, we ought to expect a very great sum, considering the long series

set fire to the citadel. A host of mules, with 5000 camels, were sent for from Mesopotamia and else-

of years that had been spent in amassing it. Alexander's own letters (Plutarch Alex. 37) stated that enough was carried away to load 10,000 mule carts and 5000 camels.

To explain the fact, of a large accumulated treasure in the Persian capitals, it must be remarked, that what we are accustomed to consider as expenses of government, were not defrayed out of the regal treasure. The military force, speaking generally, was not paid by the Great King, but summoned by requisition from the provinces, upon which the cost of maintaining the soldiers fell, over and above the ordinary tribute. The king's numerous servants and attendants received no pay in money, but in kind; provisions for maintaining the court with its retinue were furnished by the provinces, over and above the tribute. See Herodot. i. 192; and iii. 91—and a good passage of Heeren, setting forth the small public disbursements out of the regal treasure, in his account of the internal constitution of the ancient Persian Empire (Ideen über die Politik und den Verkehr der Völker der alten Welt, part i. Abth. 1. p. 511-519).

Respecting modern Persia, Jaubert remarks (Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, Paris, 1821, p. 272. ch. 30)—"Si les sommes que l'on verse dans le trésor du Shah ne sont pas exorbitantes, comparativement à l'étendue et à la population de la Perse, elles n'en sortent pas non plus que pour des dépenses indispensables qui n'en absorbent pas la moitié. Le reste est converti en lingots, en pierreries, et en divers objets d'une grande valeur et d'un transport facile en cas d'évènement: ce qui doit suffire pour empêcher qu'on ne trouve exagérés les rapports que tous les voyageurs ont faits de la magnificence de la cour de Perse. Les Perses sont assez clairvoyans pour pénétrer les motifs réels qui portent Futteh Ali Shah à thésauriser."

When Nadir-Shah conquered the Mogul Emperor Mahomed, and entered Delhi in 1739,—the imperial treasure and effects which fell into his hands is said to have amounted to £32,000,000 sterling, besides heavy contributions levied on the inhabitants (Mill, History of British India, vol. ii. B. iii. ch. 4, p. 403).—Runjeet Sing left at his death (1839) a treasure of £8,000,000 sterling: with jewels and other effects to several millions more. [The Punjaub, by Col. Steinbach, p. 16. London, 1845].

Mr. Mill remarks, in another place, that "in Hindostan, gold, silver, and gems are most commonly hoarded, and not devoted to production" (vol. i. p. 254. B. ii. ch. 5).

Herodotus (iii. 96) tells us that the gold and silver brought to the Persian regal treasure was poured in a melted state into earthen vessels; when it cooled, the earthen vessel was withdrawn, and the solid metallic mass left standing; a portion of it was cut off when occasion required

where, to carry off this prodigious treasure; the whole of which was conveyed out of Persis proper, partly to be taken along with Alexander himself in his ulterior marches, partly to be lodged in Susa and Ekbatana. Six thousand talents more, found in Pasargadæ, were added to the spoil[1]. The persons and property of the inhabitants were abandoned to the licence of the soldiers, who obtained an immense booty, not merely in gold and silver, but also in rich clothing, furniture, and ostentatious ornaments of every kind. The male inhabitants were slain[2], the females dragged into servitude; except such as obtained safety by flight, or burned themselves with their property in their own houses. Among the soldiers themselves, much angry scrambling took place for the possession of precious articles, not without occasional bloodshed[3]. As soon as

for disbursements. This practice warrants the supposition that a large portion of it was habitually accumulated, and not expended.

[1] Arrian, iii. 18, 17. He does not give the amount, which I transcribe from Curtius, v. 6, 10.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 70. Οἱ Μακεδόνες ἐπῆεσαν, τοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας πάντας φονεύοντες, τὰς δὲ κτήσεις διαρπάζοντες, &c. Curtius, v. 6, 6.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 70, 71; Curtius, v. 6, 3-7. These two authors concur in the main features of the massacre and plunder in Persepolis, permitted to the soldiers by Alexander. Arrian does not mention it: he mentions only the deliberate resolution of Alexander to burn the palace or citadel, out of revenge on the Persian name. And such feeling, assuming it to exist, would also naturally dictate the general licence to plunder and massacre. Himself entertaining such vindictive feeling, and regarding it as legitimate, Alexander would either presume it to exist, or love to kindle it, in his soldiers; by whom indeed the licence to plunder would be sufficiently welcomed, with or without any antecedent sentiment of vengeance.

The story (told by Diodorus, Curtius, and Plutarch, Alex. 38) that Alexander, in the drunkenness of a banquet, was first instigated by the courtezan Thais to set fire to the palace of Persepolis, and accompanied her to begin the conflagration with his own hand—may perhaps be so far true, that he really showed himself in the scene and helped in the

their ferocity and cupidity had been satiated, Alexander arrested the massacre. His encouragement and sanction of it was not a burst of transient fury, provoked by unexpected length of resistance, such as the hanging of the 2000 Tyrians and the dragging of Batis at Gaza—but a deliberate proceeding, intended partly as a recompense and gratification to the soldiery, but still more as an imposing manifestation of retributive vengeance against the descendants of the ancient Persian invaders. In his own letters seen by Plutarch, Alexander described the massacre of the native Persians as having been ordered by him on grounds of state policy[1].

B.C. 330, winter–spring. Alexander rests his troops, and employs himself in conquering the rest of Persis.

As it was now winter or very early spring, he suffered his main army to enjoy a month or more of repose at or near Persepolis. But he himself, at the head of a rapidly moving division, traversed the interior of Persis proper; conquering or receiving into submission the various towns and villages[2]. The greatest resistance which he experienced was offered by the rude and warlike tribe called the Mardi; but worse than any enemy was the severity of the season and the rugged destitution of a frozen country. Neither physical difficulties, however,

burning. But that his resolution to burn was deliberately taken, and even maintained against the opposition of esteemed officers, is established on the authority of Arrian.

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 37. *Φόνον μὲν οὖν ἐνταῦθα πολὺν τῶν ἁλισκομένων γενέσθαι συνέπεσε· γράφει γὰρ αὐτὸς, ὡς νομίζων αὐτῷ τοῦτο λυσιτελεῖν ἐκέλευεν ἀποσφάττεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· νομίσματος δὲ εὑρεῖν πλῆθος ὅσον ἐν Σούσοις, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην κατασκευὴν καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον ἐκκομισθῆναί φησι μυρίοις ὁρικοῖς ζεύγεσι, καὶ πεντακισχιλίαις καμήλοις.* That *ἐνταῦθα* means Persepolis, is shown by the immediately following comparison with the treasure found at Susa.

[2] Diod. xvii. 73; Curtius, v. 6, 12–20.

nor human enemies, could arrest the march of Alexander. He returned from his expedition, complete master of Persis; and in the spring, quitted that province with his whole army, to follow Darius into Media. He left only a garrison of 3000 Macedonians at Persepolis, preserving to Tiridates, who had surrendered to him the place, the title of satrap[1].

Darius a fugitive in Media.

Darius was now a fugitive, with the mere title of king, and with a simple body-guard rather than an army. On leaving Arbela after the defeat, he had struck in an easterly direction across the mountains into Media; having only a few attendants round him, and thinking himself too happy to preserve his own life from an indefatigable pursuer[2]. He calculated that, once across these mountains, Alexander would leave him for a time unmolested, in haste to march southward for the purpose of appropriating the great and real prizes of the campaign — Babylon, Susa, and Persepolis. The last struggles of this ill-starred prince will be recounted in another chapter.

[1] Curtius, v. 6, 11.

[2] Arrian, iii. 16, 1–4.

CHAPTER XCIV.

MILITARY OPERATIONS AND CONQUESTS OF ALEXANDER, AFTER HIS WINTER-QUARTERS IN PERSIS, DOWN TO HIS DEATH AT BABYLON.

B.C. 330, spring.

FROM this time forward to the close of Alexander's life—a period of about seven years—his time was spent in conquering the eastern half of the Persian empire, together with various independent tribes lying beyond its extreme boundary. But neither Greece, nor Asia Minor, nor any of his previous western acquisitions, was he ever destined to see again.

The first four Asiatic campaigns of Alexander—its direct bearing and importance in reference to Grecian history.

Now, in regard to the history of Greece—the subject of these volumes—the first portion of Alexander's Asiatic campaigns (from his crossing the Hellespont to the conquest of Persis, a period of four years, March 334 B.C. to March 330 B.C.), though not of direct bearing, is yet of material importance. Having in his first year completed the subjugation of the Hellenic world, he had by these subsequent campaigns absorbed it as a small fraction into the vast Persian empire, renovated under his imperial sceptre. He had accomplished a result substantially the same as would have been brought about if the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, destined, a century and a half before, to incorporate Greece with the Persian monarchy, had succeeded instead of failing[1]. Towards the kings of Macedonia alone,

[1] Compare the language addressed by Alexander to his weary soldiers,

the subjugation of Greece would never have become complete, so long as she could receive help from the native Persian kings, who were perfectly adequate as a countervailing and tutelary force, had they known how to play their game. But all hope for Greece from without was extinguished, when Babylon, Susa, and Persepolis became subject to the same ruler as Pella and Amphipolis—and that ruler too, the ablest general, and most insatiate aggressor, of his age; to whose name was attached the prestige of success almost superhuman. Still, against even this overwhelming power, some of the bravest of the Greeks at home tried to achieve their liberation with the sword: we shall see presently how sadly the attempt miscarried.

His last seven years, farther eastward, had no similar bearing upon Greece.

But though the first four years of Alexander's Asiatic expedition, in which he conquered the Western half of the Persian empire, had thus an important effect on the condition and destinies of the Grecian cities—his last seven years, on which we are now about to enter, employed chiefly in conquering the Eastern half, scarcely touched these cities in any way. The stupendous marches to the rivers Jaxartes, Indus, and Hyphasis, which carried his victorious arms over so wide a space of Central Asia, not only added nothing to his power over the Greeks, but even withdrew him from all dealings with them, and placed him almost beyond their cognizance. To the historian of Greece, therefore, these latter campaigns can hardly be regarded as

on the banks of the Hyphasis (Arrian, v. 26), with that which Herodotus puts into the mouth of Xerxes, when announcing his intended expedition against Greece (Herodot. vii. 8).

included within the range of his subject. They deserve to be told, as examples of military skill and energy, and as illustrating the character of the most illustrious general of antiquity—one who, though not a Greek, had become the master of all Greeks. But I shall not think it necessary to recount them in any detail, like the battles of Issus and Arbela.

B.C. 330, May-June.

Darius at Ekbatana—seeks escape towards Baktria, when he hears of Alexander approaching.

About six or seven months had elapsed from the battle of Arbela to the time when Alexander prepared to quit his most recent conquest—Persis proper. During all this time, Darius had remained at Ekbatana[1], the chief city of Media, clinging to the hope, that Alexander, when possessed of the three southern capitals and the best part of the Persian empire, might have reached the point of satiation, and might leave him unmolested in the more barren East. As soon as he learnt that Alexander was in movement towards him, he sent forward his harem and his baggage to Hyrkania, on the south-eastern border of the Caspian sea. Himself, with the small force around him, followed in the same direction, carrying off the treasure in the city (7000 talents = £1,610,000 in amount),

[1] I see no reason for doubting that the Ekbatana here meant is the modern Hamadan. See a valuable Appendix added by Dr. Thirlwall to the sixth volume of his History of Greece, in which this question is argued against Mr. Williams.

Sir John Malcolm observes—"There can hardly be said to be any roads in Persia; nor are they much required, for the use of wheel carriages has not yet been introduced into that kingdom. Nothing can be more rugged and difficult than the paths which have been cut over the mountains by which it is bounded and intersected" (ch. xxiv. vol. ii. p. 525).

In this respect, indeed, as in others, the modern state of Persia must be inferior to the ancient; witness the description given by Herodotus of the road between Sardis and Susa.

and passed through the Caspian Gates into the territory of Parthyênê. His only chance was to escape to Baktria at the eastern extremity of the empire, ruining the country in his way for the purpose of retarding pursuers. But this chance diminished every day, from desertion among his few followers, and angry disgust among many who remained[1].

Alexander enters Ekbatana—establishes there his depôt and base of operations.

Eight days after Darius had quitted Ekbatana, Alexander entered it. How many days had been occupied in his march from Persepolis, we cannot say: in itself a long march, it had been farther prolonged, partly by the necessity of subduing the intervening mountaineers called Paræta kenî[2], partly by rumours exaggerating the Persian force at Ekbatana, and inducing him to advance with precaution and regular array. Possessed of Ekbatana—the last capital stronghold of the Persian kings, and their ordinary residence during the summer months—he halted to rest his troops, and establish a new base of operations for his future proceedings eastward. He made Ekbatana his principal depôt; depositing in the citadel, under the care of Harpalus as treasurer, with a garrison of 6000 or 7000 Macedonians, the accumulated treasures of his past conquests, out of Susa and Persepolis; amounting, we are told, to the enormous sum of 180,000 talents = £41,400,000 sterling[3]. Parmenio was invested with the chief command of this import-

[1] Arrian, iii. 19, 2-9; iii. 20, 3.

[2] Arrian, iii. 19, 5.

[3] Arrian, iii. 19, 14; Diodor. xvii. 80. Diodorus had before stated (xvii. 66, 71) the treasure in Susa as being 49,000 talents, and that in Persepolis as 120,000. Arrian announces the treasure in Susa as 50,000 talents—Curtius gives the uncoined gold and silver alone as 50,000

ant post, and of the military force left in Media; of which territory Oxodates, a Persian who had been imprisoned at Susa by Darius, was named satrap[1].

B.C. 330, June–July.

Alexander sends home the Thessalian cavalry —necessity for him now to pursue a more desultory warfare.

At Ekbatana Alexander was joined by a fresh force of 6000 Grecian mercenaries[2], who had marched from Kilikia into the interior, probably crossing the Euphrates and Tigris at the same points as Alexander himself had crossed. Hence he was enabled the better to dismiss his Thessalian cavalry, with other Greeks who had been serving during his four years of Asiatic war, and who now wished to go home[3]. He distributed among them the sum of 2000 talents in addition to their full pay, and gave them the price of their horses, which they sold before departure. The operations which he was now about to commence against the eastern territories of Persia were not against regular armies, but against flying corps and distinct native tribes, relying for defence chiefly on the difficulties which mountains, deserts, privation, or mere distance, would throw in the way of an assailant. For these purposes he required an increased number of light troops, and was obliged to impose even upon his heavy-armed cavalry the most rapid and fatiguing marches, such as none but his Macedonian Companions would have been contented to execute; moreover he was called upon to act less with large masses, and more with small and broken divisions.

talents (v. 8, 11). The treasure of both places was transported to Ekbatana.

[1] Arrian, iii. 20, 4.

[2] Curtius, v. 23, 12.

[3] Arrian, iii. 19, 10: compare v. 27, 7.

He now therefore for the first time established a regular Taxis, or division of horse-bowmen[1].

Alexander pursues Darius to the Caspian Gates, but fails in overtaking him.

Remaining at Ekbatana no longer than was sufficient for these new arrangements, Alexander recommenced his pursuit of Darius. He hoped to get before Darius to the Caspian Gates, at the north-eastern extremity of Media; by which Gates[2] was understood a mountain-pass, or rather a road of many hours' march, including several difficult passes stretching eastward along the southern side

[1] Arrian, iii. 24, 1. ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ἱππακοντίσται ἦσαν τάξις.

See the remarks of Rüstow and Köchly upon the change made by Alexander in his military organization about this period, as soon as he found that there was no farther chance of a large collected Persian force, able to meet him in the field (Geschichte des Griech. Kriegswesens, p. 252 *seq.*). The change which they point out was real,—but I think they exaggerate it in degree.

[2] The passes called the Caspian Gates appear to be those described by Morier, Fraser, and other modern travellers, as the series of narrow valleys and defiles called Ser-Desch, Sirdari, or Serdara Khan,—on the southernmost of the two roads which lead eastward from Teheran towards Damaghan, and thence farther eastward towards Mesched and Herat. See the note of Mützel in his edition of Curtius, v. 35, 2, p. 489; also Morier, Second Journey through Persia, p. 363; Fraser's Narrative of a Journey into Khorasan, p. 291.

The long range of mountains, called by the ancients Taurus, extends from Lesser Media and Armenia in an easterly direction along the southern coast of the Caspian Sea. Its northern declivity, covered by prodigious forests with valleys and plains of no great breadth reaching to the Caspian, comprehends the moist and fertile territories now denominated Ghilan and Mazanderan. The eastern portion of Mazanderan was known in ancient times as Hyrkania, then productive and populous; while the mountain range itself was occupied by various rude and warlike tribes—Kadusii, Mardi, Tapyri, &c. The mountain range, now called Elburz, includes among other lofty eminences the very high peak of Demavend.

The road from Ekbatana to Baktra, along which both the flight of Darius and the pursuit of Alexander lay, passed along the broken ground skirting the southern flank of the mountain range Elburz. Of this broken ground the Caspian Gates formed the worst and most difficult portion.

of the great range of Taurus towards Parthia. He marched with his Companion-cavalry, the light-horse, the Agrianians, and the bowmen—the greater part of the phalanx keeping up as well as it could —to Rhagæ, about fifty miles north of the Caspian Gates; which town he reached in eleven days, by exertions so severe that many men as well as horses were disabled on the road. But in spite of all speed, he learnt that Darius had already passed through the Caspian Gates. After five days of halt at Rhagæ, indispensable for his army, Alexander passed them also. A day's march on the other side of them, he was joined by two eminent Persians, Bagistanes and Antibêlus, who informed him that Darius was already dethroned and in imminent danger of losing his life[1].

B.C. 330, July. Conspiracy formed against Darius by Bessus and others, who seize his person.

The conspirators by whom this had been done, were Bessus, satrap of Baktria—Barsaentes, satrap of Drangiana and Arachosia—and Nabarzanes, general of the regal guards. The small force of Darius having been thinned by daily desertion, most of those who remained were the contingents of the still unconquered territories, Baktria, Arachosia, and Drangiana, under the orders of their respective satraps. The Grecian mercenaries, 1500 in number, and Artabazus, with a band under his special command, adhered inflexibly to Darius, but the soldiers of Eastern Asia followed their own satraps. Bessus and his colleagues intended to make their peace with Alexander by surrendering Darius, should Alexander pursue so vigorously as to leave them no hope of escape; but if they could

[1] Arrian, iii. 20, 21.

obtain time to reach Baktria and Sogdiana, they resolved to organise an energetic resistance, under their own joint command, for the defence of those eastern provinces—the most warlike population of the empire[1]. Under the desperate circumstances of the case, this plan was perhaps the least unpromising that could be proposed. The chance of resisting Alexander, small as it was at the best, became absolutely nothing under the command of Darius, who had twice set the example of flight from the field of battle, betraying both his friends and his empire, even when surrounded by the full force of Persia. For brave and energetic Persians, unless they were prepared at once to submit to the invader, there was no choice but to set aside Darius; nor does it appear that the conspirators intended at first anything worse. At a village called Thara in Parthia, they bound him in chains of gold—placed him in a covered chariot surrounded by the Baktrian troops,—and thus carried him onward, retreating as fast as they could; Bessus assuming the command. Artabazus, with the Grecian mercenaries, too feeble to prevent the proceeding, quitted the army in disgust, and sought refuge among the mountains of the Tapuri bordering on Hyrkania towards the Caspian Sea[2].

[1] Masistes, after the shocking outrage upon his wife by Queen Amestris, was going to Baktria to organise a revolt: see Herodot. ix. 113—about the importance of that satrapy.

[2] Arrian, iii. 21–23. Justin (xi. 15) specifies the name of the place—Thara. Both he and Curtius mention the *golden chain* (Curtius, v. 34, 20). Probably the conspirators made use of some chains which had formed a part of the ornaments of the royal wardrobe. Among the presents given by Darius son of Hystaspes to the surgeon Demokedes, there were two pairs of golden chains—Δωρέεται δὴ μιν Δαρεῖος πεδέων χρυ-

Prodigious efforts of Alexander to overtake and get possession of Darius. He surprises the Persian corps, but Bessus puts Darius to death.

On hearing this intelligence, Alexander strained every nerve to overtake the fugitives and get possession of the person of Darius. At the head of his Companion-cavalry, his light-horse, and a body of infantry picked out for their strength and activity, he put himself in instant march, with nothing but arms and two days' provisions for each man; leaving Kraterus to bring on the main body by easier journeys. A forced march of two nights and one day, interrupted only by a short midday repose (it was now the month of July), brought him at daybreak to the Persian camp which his informant Bagistanes had quitted. But Bessus and his troops were already beyond it, having made considerable advance in their flight; upon which Alexander, notwithstanding the exhaustion both of men and horses, pushed on with increased speed through all the night to the ensuing day at noon. He there found himself in the village where Bessus had encamped on the preceding day. Yet learning from deserters that his enemies had resolved to hasten their retreat by night marches, he despaired of overtaking them, unless he could find some shorter road. He was informed that there was another shorter, but leading through a waterless desert. Setting out by this road late in the day with his cavalry, he got over no less than forty-five miles during the night, so as to come on Bessus by complete surprise on the following morning. The Persians, marching in disorder without arms, and having no expectation of an enemy, were so

σέων δύο ζεύγεσιν—Herodot. iii. 130; compare iii. 15. The Persian king and grandees habitually wore golden chains round neck and arms.

panic-struck at the sudden appearance of their indefatigable conqueror, that they dispersed and fled without any attempt to resist. In this critical moment, Bessus and Barsaentes urged Darius to leave his chariot, mount his horse, and accompany them in their flight. But he refused to comply. They were determined however that he should not fall alive into the hands of Alexander, whereby his name would have been employed against them, and would have materially lessened their chance of defending the eastern provinces; they were moreover incensed by his refusal, and had contracted a feeling of hatred and contempt to which they were glad to give effect. Casting their javelins at him, they left him mortally wounded, and then pursued their flight[1]. His chariot, not distinguished by any visible mark, nor known even to the Persian soldiers themselves, was for some time not detected by the pursuers. At length a Macedonian soldier named Polystratus found him expiring, and is said to have received his last words; wherein he expressed thanks to Alexander for the kind treatment of his captive female relatives, and satisfaction that the Persian throne, lost to himself, was about to pass to so generous a conqueror. It is at least certain that he never lived to see Alexander himself[2].

Alexander had made the prodigious and inde-

> "Rarus apud Medos regum cruor; unaque cuncto
> Pœna manet generi: quamvis crudelibus æque
> Paretur dominis."—(Claudian. in Eutrop. ii. p. 478.)

Court conspiracies and assassinations of the prince, however, were not unknown either among the Achæmenidæ or the Arsakidæ.

[2] This account of the remarkable incidents immediately preceding the death of Darius, is taken mainly from Arrian (iii. 21), and seems one of the most authentic chapters of his work. He is very sparing in

Disappointment of Alexander when he missed taking Dariusalive.

fatigable marches of the last four days, not without destruction to many men and horses, for the express purpose of taking Darius alive. It would have been a gratification to his vanity to exhibit the Great King as a helpless captive, rescued from his own servants by the sword of his enemy, and spared to occupy some subordinate command as a token of ostentatious indulgence. Moreover, apart from such feelings, it would have been a point of real advantage to seize the person of Darius, by means of whose name Alexander would have been enabled to stifle all farther resistance in the extensive and imperfectly known regions eastward of the Caspian Gates. The satraps of these regions had now gone thither with their hands free, to kindle as much Asiatic sentiment and levy as large a force as they could, against the Macedonian conqueror; who was obliged to follow them, if he wished to complete the subjugation of the empire. We can understand therefore that Alexander was deeply mortified in deriving no result from this ruinously fatiguing march, and can the better explain that savage wrath which we shall hereafter find him manifesting against the satrap Bessus.

Regal funeral bestowed upon Darius. His fate and conduct.

Alexander caused the body of Darius to be buried, with full pomp and ceremonial, in the regal sepulchres of Persis. The last days of this unfortunate prince

telling what passed in the Persian camp; he mentions indeed only the communications made by the Persian deserters to Alexander.

Curtius (v. 27–34) gives the narrative far more vaguely and loosely than Arrian, but with ample details of what was going on in the Persian camp. We should have been glad to know from whom these details were borrowed. In the main they do not contradict the narrative of Arrian, but rather amplify and dilute it.

Diodorus (xvii. 73), Plutarch (Alexand. 42, 43), and Justin (xi. 15) give no new information.

have been described with almost tragic pathos by historians; and there are few subjects in history better calculated to excite such a feeling, if we regard simply the magnitude of his fall, from the highest pitch of power and splendour to defeat, degradation, and assassination. But an impartial review will not allow us to forget that the main cause of such ruin was his own blindness—his long apathy after the battle of Issus, and abandonment of Tyre and Gaza, in the fond hope of repurchasing queens whom he had himself exposed to captivity —lastly, what is still less pardonable, his personal cowardice in both the two decisive battles deliberately brought about by himself. If we follow his conduct throughout the struggle, we shall find little of that which renders a defeated prince either respectable or interesting. Those who had the greatest reason to denounce and despise him were his friends and countrymen, whom he possessed ample means of defending, yet threw those means away. On the other hand, no one had better grounds for indulgence towards him than his conqueror; for whom he had kept unused the countless treasures of the three capitals, and for whom he had lightened in every way the difficulties of a conquest, in itself hardly less than impracticable[1].

B.C. 330, July. Repose of Alexander and his army at Hekatompylus in Parthia. Commencing alteration in his demeanour. He becomes Asiatized and despotic.

The recent forced march, undertaken by Alexander for the purpose of securing Darius as a captive, had been distressing in the extreme to his soldiers, who required a certain period of repose

[1] Arrian (iii. 22) gives an indulgent criticism on Darius, dwelling chiefly upon his misfortunes, but calling him *ἀνδρὶ τὰ μὲν πολέμια, εἴπερ τινὶ ἄλλῳ, μαλθακῷ τε καὶ οὐ φρενήρει*, &c.

and compensation. This was granted to them at the town of Hekatompylus in Parthia, where the whole army was again united. Besides abundant supplies from the neighbouring region, the soldiers here received a donative derived from the large booty taken in the camp of Darius[1]. In the enjoyment and revelry universal throughout the army, Alexander himself partook. His indulgences in the banquet and in wine-drinking, to which he was always addicted when leisure allowed, were now unusually multiplied and prolonged. Public solemnities were celebrated, together with theatrical exhibitions by artists who joined the army from Greece. But the change of most importance in Alexander's conduct was, that he now began to feel and act manifestly as successor of Darius on the Persian throne; to disdain the comparative simplicity of Macedonian habits, and to assume the pomp, the ostentatious apparatus of luxuries, and even the dress, of a Persian king.

Gradual aggravation of these new habits, from the present moment.

To many of Alexander's soldiers, the conquest of Persia appeared to be consummated, and the war finished, by the death of Darius. They were reluctant to exchange the repose and enjoyments of Hekatompylus for fresh fatigues; but Alexander, assembling the select regiments, addressed to them

B.C. 330, September. Alexander conquers the mountains immediately south of the Caspian. He requires the Greek mercenaries to surrender at discretion.

[1] Curtius, vi. 5, 10; vi. 6, 15. Diodor. xvii. 74. Hekatompylus was an important position, where several roads joined (Polyb. x. 28). It was situated on one of the roads running eastward from the Caspian Gates, on the southern flank of Mount Taurus (Elburz). Its locality cannot be fixed with certainty: Ritter (Erdkunde, part viii. 465, 467) with others conceives it to have been near Damaghan; Forbiger (Handbuch der Alten Geographie, vol. ii. p. 549) places it farther eastward, near Jai-Jerm. Mr. Long notes it on his map, as *site unknown*.

an emphatic appeal which revived the ardour of all[1]. His first march was, across one of the passes from the south to the north of Mount Elburz, into Hyrkania, the region bordering the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea. Here he found no resistance; the Hyrkanian satrap Phrataphernes, together with Nabarzanes, Artabazus, and other eminent Persians, surrendered themselves to him, and were favourably received. The Greek mercenaries, 1500 in number, who had served with Darius, but had retired when that monarch was placed under arrest by Bessus, sent envoys requesting to be allowed to surrender on capitulation. But Alexander—reproaching them with guilt for having taken service with the Persians, in contravention of the vote passed by the Hellenic synod—required them to surrender at discretion; which they expressed their readiness to do, praying that an officer might be despatched to conduct them to him in safety[2]. The Macedonian Andronikus was sent for this purpose, while Alexander undertook an expedition into the mountains of the Mardi; a name seemingly borne by several distinct tribes in parts remote from each other, but all poor and brave mountaineers. These Mardi occupied parts of the northern slope of the range of Mount Elburz a few miles from the Caspian Sea (Mazanderan and Ghilan). Alexander pursued them into all their retreats,—overcame them, when they stood on their defence, with great slaughter,—and reduced the

[1] This was attested by his own letters to Antipater, which Plutarch had seen (Plutarch, Alexand. 47). Curtius composes a long speech for Alexander (vi. 7, 9).

[2] Arrian, iii. 23, 15.

remnant of the half-destroyed tribes to sue for peace[1].

Envoys from Sparta and other Greek cities brought to him—how treated.

From this march, which had carried him in a westerly direction, he returned to Hyrkania. At the first halt he was met by the Grecian mercenaries who came to surrender themselves, as well as by various Grecian envoys from Sparta, Chalkedon, and Sinopê, who had accompanied Darius in his flight. Alexander put the Lacedæmonians under arrest, but liberated the other envoys, considering Chalkedon and Sinopê to have been subjects of Darius, not members of the Hellenic synod. As to the mercenaries, he made a distinction between those who had enlisted in the Persian service before the recognition of Philip as leader of Greece —and those whose enlistment had been of later date. The former he liberated at once; the latter he required to remain in his service under the command of Andronikus, on the same pay as they had hitherto received[2]. Such was the untoward conclusion of Grecian mercenary service with Persia; a system whereby the Persian monarchs, had they known how to employ it with tolerable ability, might well have maintained their empire even against such an enemy as Alexander[3].

[1] Arrian, iii. 24, 4. In reference to the mountain tribes called Mardi, who are mentioned in several different localities—on the parts of Mount Taurus south of the Caspian, in Armenia, on Mount Zagros, and in Persis proper (see Strabo, xi. p. 508–523; Herodot. i. 125), we may note, that the Nomadic tribes, who constitute a considerable fraction of the population of the modern Persian Empire, are at this day found under the same name in spots widely distant: see Jaubert, Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, p. 254.

[2] Arrian, iii. 24, 8; Curtius, vi. 5, 9. An Athenian officer named Demokrates slew himself in despair, disdaining to surrender.

[3] See a curious passage on this subject, at the end of the Cyropædia of Xenophon.

B.C. 330, September.

March of Alexander farther eastward—his successes in Aria and Drangiana.

After fifteen days of repose and festivity at Zeudracarta, the chief town of Hyrkania, Alexander marched eastward with his united army through Parthia into Aria—the region adjoining the modern Herat with its river now known as Herirood. Satibarzanes, the satrap of Aria, came to him near the border, to a town named Susia[1], submitted, and was allowed to retain his satrapy; while Alexander, merely skirting the northern border of Aria, marched in a direction nearly east towards Baktria against the satrap Bessus, who was reported as having proclaimed himself King of Persia. But it was discovered, after three or four days, that Satibarzanes was in league with Bessus; upon which Alexander suspended for the present his plans against Baktria, and turned by forced marches to Artakoana, the chief city of Aria[2]. His return was so unexpectedly rapid, that the Arians were overawed, and Satibarzanes was obliged to escape. A

[1] Arrian, iii. 25, 3–8. Droysen and Dr. Thirlwall identify Susia with the town now called Tûs or Toos, a few miles north-west of Mesched. Professor Wilson (Ariana Antiqua, p. 177) thinks that this is too much to the west, and too far from Herat: he conceives Susia to be Zuzan, on the desert side of the mountains west of Herat. Mr. Prinsep (Notes on the historical results deducible from discoveries in Afghanistan, p. 14) places it at Subzawar, south of Herat, and within the region of fertility.

Tûs seems to lie in the line of Alexander's march, more than the other two places indicated; Subzawar is too far to the south. Alexander appears to have first directed his march from Parthia to Baktria (in the line from Asterabad to Balkh through Margiana), merely touching the borders of Aria in his route.

[2] Artakoana, as well as the subsequent city of Alexandria in Ariis, are both supposed by Wilson to coincide with the locality of Herat (Wilson, Ariana Antiqua, p. 152–177).

There are two routes from Herat to Asterabad, at the south-east corner of the Caspian; one by Schahrood, which is 533 English miles; the other by Mesched, which is 688 English miles (Wilson, p. 149).

few days enabled him to crush the disaffected Arians and to await the arrival of his rear division under Kraterus. He then marched southward into the territory of the Drangi, or Drangiana (the modern Seiestan), where he found no resistance —the satrap Barsaentes having sought safety among some of the Indians[1].

B.C. 330, October. Proceedings against Philotas, son of Parmenio, in Drangiana. Military greatness and consideration of the family.

In the chief town of Drangiana occurred the revolting tragedy, of which Philotas was the first victim, and his father Parmenio the second. Parmenio, now seventy years of age, and therefore little qualified for the fatigue inseparable from the invasion of the eastern satrapies, had been left in the important post of commanding the great depôt and treasure at Ekbatana. His long military experience, and confidential position even under Philip, rendered him the second person in the Macedonian army, next to Alexander himself. His three sons were all soldiers. The youngest of them, Hektor, had been accidentally drowned in the Nile, while in the suite of Alexander in Egypt; the second, Nikanor, had commanded the hypaspists or light infantry, but had died of illness, fortunately for himself, a short time before[2]; the eldest, Philotas, occupied the high rank of general of the Companion-cavalry, in daily communication with Alexander, from whom he received personal orders.

A revelation came to Philotas, from Kebalinus, brother of a youth named Nikomachus, that a sol-

[1] Arrian, iii. 25; Curtius, vi. 24, 36. The territory of the Drangi, or Zarangi, southward from Aria, coincides generally with the modern Seistan, adjoining the lake now called Zareh, which receives the waters of the river Hilmend.

[2] Arrian, iii. 25, 6; Curtius, iv. 8, 7; vi. 6, 19.

dier, named Dimnus of Chalastra, had made boast to Nikomachus, his intimate friend or beloved person, under vows of secrecy, of an intended conspiracy against Alexander, inviting him to become an accomplice[1]. Nikomachus, at first struck with abhorrence, at length simulated compliance, asked who were the accomplices of Dimnus, and received intimation of a few names; all of which he presently communicated to his brother Kebalinus, for the purpose of being divulged. Kebalinus told the facts to Philotas, entreating him to mention them to Alexander. But Philotas, though every day in communication with the king, neglected to do this for two days; upon which Kebalinus began to suspect him of connivance, and caused the revelation to be made to Alexander through one of the pages named Metron. Dimnus was immediately arrested, but ran himself through with his sword, and expired without making any declaration[2].

Revelation of an intended conspiracy made by Kebalinus to Philotas, for the purpose of being communicated to Alexander. Philotas does not mention it to Alexander. It is communicated to the latter through another channel.

Of this conspiracy, real or pretended, every thing rested on the testimony of Nikomachus. Alexander indignantly sent for Philotas, demanding why he had omitted for two days to communicate what he had heard. Philotas replied, that the source from which it came was too contemptible to deserve notice—that it would have been ridiculous to attach importance to the simple declarations of such a youth as Nikomachus, recounting the foolish boasts

Alexander is at first angry with Philotas, but accepts his explanation, and professes to pass over the fact.

[1] Curtius, vi. 7, 2. "Dimnus, modicæ apud regem auctoritatis et gratiæ, exoleti, cui Nicomacho erat nomen, amore flagrabat, obsequio uni sibi dediti corporis vinctus." Plutarch, Alex. 49; Diodor. xvii. 79.

[2] Curt. vi. 7, 29; Plutarch, Alex. 49. The latter says that Dimnus resisted the officer sent to arrest him, and was killed by him in the combat.

addressed to him by a lover. Alexander received, or affected to receive, the explanation, gave his hand to Philotas, invited him to supper, and talked to him with his usual familiarity[1].

Ancient grudge against Philotas—advantage taken of the incident to ruin him.

But it soon appeared that advantage was to be taken of this incident for the disgrace and ruin of Philotas, whose free-spoken criticisms on the pretended divine paternity, — coupled with boasts, that he and his father Parmenio had been chief agents in the conquest of Asia,—had neither been forgotten nor forgiven. These and other self-praises, disparaging to the glory of Alexander, had been divulged by a mistress to whom Philotas was attached; a beautiful Macedonian woman of Pydna, named Antigonê, who, having first been made a prize in visiting Samothrace by the Persian admiral Autophradates, was afterwards taken amidst the spoils of Damascus by the Macedonians victorious at Issus. The reports of Antigonê, respecting some unguarded language held by Philotas to her, had come to the knowledge of Kraterus, who brought her to Alexander, and caused her to repeat them to him. Alexander desired her to take secret note of the confidential expressions of Philotas, and report them from time to time to himself[2].

Kraterus and others are jealous of Parmenio and Philotas. Alexander is persuaded to put them both to death.

It thus turned out that Alexander, though continuing to Philotas his high military rank, and talking to him constantly with seeming confidence, had for at least eighteen months, ever since his

[1] Curtius, vi. 7, 33. "Philotas respondit, Cebalinum quidem scorti sermonem ad se detulisse, sed ipsum tam levi auctori nihil credidisse —veritum, ne jurgium inter amatorem et exoletum non sine risu aliorum detulisset."

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 48.

conquest of Egypt and perhaps even earlier, disliked and suspected him, keeping him under perpetual watch through the suborned and secret communications of a treacherous mistress[1]. Some of the generals around Alexander—especially Kraterus, the first suborner of Antigonê—fomented these suspicions, from jealousy of the great ascendency of Parmenio and his family. Moreover, Philotas himself was ostentatious and overbearing in his demeanour, so as to have made many enemies among the soldiers[2]. But whatever may have been his defects on this head—defects which he shared with the other Macedonian generals, all gorged with plunder and presents[3]—his fidelity as well as his military merits stand attested by the fact that Alexander had continued to employ him in the highest and most confidential command throughout all the long subsequent interval; and that Parmenio was now general at Ekbatana, the most important military appointment which the king had to confer. Even granting the deposition of Nikomachus to be trustworthy, there was nothing to implicate Philotas,

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 48, 49. Πρὸς δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐκ πάνυ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐτύγχανε διαβεβλημένος (Philotas)..... Ὁ μὲν οὖν Φιλώτας ἐπιβουλευόμενος οὕτως ἠγνόει, καὶ συνῆν τῇ Ἀντιγόνῃ πολλὰ καὶ πρὸς ὀργὴν καὶ μεγαλαυχίαν ῥήματα καὶ λόγους κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀνεπιτηδείους προϊέμενος.

Both Ptolemy and Aristobulus recognised these previous communications made to Alexander against Philotas in Egypt, but stated that he did not believe them (Arrian, iii. 26, 1).

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 40–48; Curtius, vi. 11, 3.

[3] Phylarchus, Fragment. 41. ed. Didot, ap. Athenæum, xii. p. 539; Plutarch, Alexand. 39, 40. Even Eumenes enriched himself much; though being only secretary, and a Greek, he could not take the same liberties as the great native Macedonian generals (Plutarch, Eumenes, 2).

whose name had not been included among the accomplices said to have been enumerated by Dimnus. There was not a tittle of evidence against him, except the fact that the deposition had been made known to him, and that he had seen Alexander twice without communicating it. Upon this single fact, however, Kraterus and the other enemies of Philotas worked so effectually as to inflame the suspicions and the pre-existing ill will of Alexander into fierce rancour. He resolved on the disgrace, torture, and death, of Philotas,—and on the death of Parmenio besides[1].

Arrest of Philotas. Alexander accuses him before the assembled soldiers. He is condemned.

To accomplish this, however, against the two highest officers in the Macedonian service, one of them enjoying a separate and distant command—required management. Alexander was obliged to carry the feelings of the soldiers along with him, and to obtain a condemnation from the army; according to an ancient Macedonian custom, in regard to capital crimes, though (as it seems) not uniformly practised. Alexander not only kept the resolution secret, but is even said to have invited Philotas to supper with the other officers, conversing with him just as usual[2]. In the middle of the night, Philotas was arrested while asleep in his bed,—put in chains,—and clothed in an ignoble garb. A military assembly was convened at daybreak, before which Alexander appeared with the chief officers in his confidence. Addressing the soldiers in a

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 49; Curtius, vi. 8.

[2] Curtius, vi. 8, 16. "Invitatus est etiam Philotas ad ultimas sibi epulas; et rex non cœnare modo, sed etiam familiariter colloqui, cum eo quem damnaverat, sustinuit."

vehement tone of mingled sorrow and anger, he proclaimed to them that his life had just been providentially rescued from a dangerous conspiracy organized by two men hitherto trusted as his best friends—Philotas and Parmenio—through the intended agency of a soldier named Dimnus, who had slain himself when arrested. The dead body of Dimnus was then exhibited to the meeting, while Nikomachus and Kebalinus were brought forward to tell their story. A letter from Parmenio to his sons Philotas and Nikanor, found among the papers seized on the arrest, was read to the meeting. Its terms were altogether vague and unmeaning; but Alexander chose to construe them as it suited his purpose[1].

We may easily conceive the impression produced upon these assembled soldiers by such denunciations from Alexander himself—revelations of his own personal danger, and reproaches against treacherous friends. Amyntas, and even Kœnus, the brother-in-law of Philotas, were yet more unmeasured in their invectives against the accused[2]. They, as well as the other officers with whom the arrest had been concerted, set the example of violent manifestation against him, and ardent sympathy with the king's danger. Philotas was heard in his defence, which, though strenuously denying the charge, is said to have been feeble. It was indeed sure to be so, coming from one seized thus suddenly, and overwhelmed with disadvantages;

[1] Arrian, iii. 26, 2. Λέγει δὲ Πτολεμαῖος εἰσαχθῆναι ἐς Μακεδόνας Φιλώταν, καὶ κατηγορῆσαι αὐτοῦ ἰσχυρῶς Ἀλέξανδρον, &c. Curtius, vi. 9, 13; Diodor. xvii. 80.

[2] Curtius, vi. 9, 30.

while a degree of courage, absolutely heroic, would have been required for any one else to rise and presume to criticise the proofs. A soldier named Bolon harangued his comrades on the insupportable insolence of Philotas, who always (he said) treated the soldiers with contempt, turning them out of their quarters to make room for his countless retinue of slaves. Though this allegation (probably enough well-founded) was noway connected with the charge of treason against the king, it harmonized fully with the temper of the assembly, and wound them up to the last pitch of fury. The royal pages began the cry, echoed by all around, that they would with their own hands tear the parricide in pieces[1].

Philotas is put to the torture, and forced to confess, both against himself and Parmenio.

It would have been fortunate for Philotas if their wrath had been sufficiently ungovernable to instigate the execution of such a sentence on the spot. But this did not suit the purpose of his enemies. Aware that he had been condemned upon the regal word, with nothing better than the faintest negative ground of suspicion, they determined to extort from him a confession such as would justify their own purposes, not only against him, but against his father Parmenio—whom there was as yet nothing to implicate. Accordingly, during the ensuing night, Philotas was put to the torture. Hephæstion, Kraterus, and Kœnus—the last of the three being brother-in-law of Philotas[2]—themselves su-

[1] Curtius, vi. 11, 8. "Tum vero universa concio accensa est, et à corporis custodibus initium factum, clamantibus, discerpendum esse parricidam manibus eorum. 'Id quidem Philotas, qui graviora supplicia meruerat, haud sane iniquo animo audiebat."

[2] Curtius, vi. 9, 30; vi. 11, 11.

perintended the ministers of physical suffering. Alexander himself too was at hand, but concealed by a curtain. It is said that Philotas manifested little firmness under torture, and that Alexander, an unseen witness, indulged in sneers against the cowardice of one who had fought by his side in so many battles[1]. All who stood by were enemies, and likely to describe the conduct of Philotas in such manner as to justify their own hatred. The tortures inflicted[2], cruel in the extreme and long continued, wrung from him at last a confession, implicating his father along with himself. He was put to death; and at the same time, all those whose names had been indicated by Nikomachus, were slain also—apparently by being stoned, without preliminary torture. Philotas had serving in the army a numerous kindred, all of whom were struck with consternation at the news of his being tortured. It was the Macedonian law that all kinsmen of a man guilty of treason were doomed to death along with him. Accordingly, some of these men slew themselves, others fled from the camp, seeking refuge wherever they could. Such was the terror and tumult in the camp, that Alexander was obliged to proclaim a suspension of this sanguinary law for the occasion[3].

It now remained to kill Parmenio, who could not

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 49.

[2] Curtius, vi. 11, 15. "Per ultimos deinde cruciatus, utpote et damnatus et inimicis in gratiam regis torquentibus, lacceratur. Ac primo quidem, quanquam hinc ignis, illinc verbera, jam non ad quæstionem, sed ad pœnam, ingerebantur, non vocem modo, sed etiam gemitus habuit in potestate; sed postquam intumescens corpus ulceribus flagellorum ictus nudis ossibus incussos ferre non poterat," &c.

[3] Curtius, vi. 11, 20.

Parmenio is slain at Ekbatana, by order and contrivance of Alexander.

be safely left alive after the atrocities used towards Philotas; and to kill him, moreover, before he could have time to hear of them, since he was not only the oldest, most respected, and most influential of all Macedonian officers, but also in separate command of the great depôt at Ekbatana. Alexander summoned to his presence one of the Companions named Polydamas; a particular friend, comrade, or *aide de camp*, of Parmenio. Every friend of Philotas felt at this moment that his life hung by a thread; so that Polydamas entered the king's presence in extreme terror, the rather as he was ordered to bring with him his two younger brothers. Alexander addressed him, denouncing Parmenio as a traitor, and intimating that Polydamas would be required to carry a swift and confidential message to Ekbatana, ordering his execution. Polydamas was selected as the attached friend of Parmenio, and therefore as best calculated to deceive him. Two letters were placed in his hands, addressed to Parmenio; one from Alexander himself, conveying ostensibly military communications and orders; the other, signed with the seal-ring of the deceased Philotas, and purporting to be addressed by the son to the father. Together with these, Polydamas received the real and important despatch, addressed by Alexander to Kleander and Menidas, the officers immediately subordinate to Parmenio at Ekbatana; proclaiming Parmenio guilty of high treason, and directing them to kill him at once. Large rewards were offered to Polydamas if he performed this commission with success, while his two brothers were retained as hostages against scruples or compunc-

tion. He promised even more than was demanded —too happy to purchase this reprieve from what had seemed impending death. Furnished with native guides and with swift dromedaries, he struck by the straightest road across the desert of Khorasan, and arrived at Ekbatana on the eleventh day—a distance usually requiring more than thirty days to traverse[1]. Entering the camp by night, without the knowledge of Parmenio, he delivered his despatch to Kleander, with whom he concerted measures. On the morrow he was admitted to Parmenio, while walking in his garden with Kleander and the other officers marked out by Alexander's order as his executioners. Polydamas ran to embrace his old friend, and was heartily welcomed by the unsuspecting veteran, to whom he presented the letters professedly coming from Alexander and Philotas. While Parmenio was absorbed in the perusal, he was suddenly assailed by a mortal stab from the hand and sword of Kleander. Other wounds were heaped upon him as he fell, by the remaining officers,—the last even after life had departed[2].

[1] Strabo, xv. p. 724; Diodor. xvii. 80; Curtius, vii. 2, 11-18.

[2] Curtius, vii. 2, 27. The proceedings respecting Philotas and Parmenio are recounted in the greatest detail by Curtius; but his details are in general harmony with the brief heads given by Arrian from Ptolemy and Aristobulus—except as to one material point. Plutarch (Alex. 49), Diodorus (xvii. 79, 80), and Justin (xii. 5), also state the facts in the same manner.

Ptolemy and Aristobulus, according to the narrative of Arrian, appear to have considered that Philotas was really implicated in a conspiracy against Alexander's life. But when we analyse what they are reported to have said, their opinion will not be found entitled to much weight. In the first place, they state (Arr. iii. 26, 1) that the *conspiracy of Philotas had been before made known to Alexander while he was in Egypt,*

Mutiny of the soldiers when they learn the assassination of Parmenio—appeased by the production of Alexander's order.

The soldiers in Ekbatana, on hearing of this bloody deed, burst into furious mutiny, surrounded the garden wall, and threatened to break in for the purpose of avenging their general, unless Polydamas and the other murderers should be delivered to them. But Kleander, admitting a few of the ringleaders, exhibited to them Alexander's written orders, to which the soldiers yielded, not without murmurs of reluctance and indignation. Most of them dispersed, yet a few remained, entreating permission to bury Parmenio's body. Even this was long re-

but that he did not then believe it. Now eighteen months had elapsed since the stay in Egypt; and the idea of a conspiracy going on for eighteen months is preposterous. That Philotas was in a mood in which he might be supposed likely to conspire, is one proposition; that he actually did conspire, is another; Arrian and his authorities run the two together as if they were one. As to the evidence purporting to prove that Philotas did conspire, Arrian tells us that "the informers came forward before the assembled soldiers and convicted Philotas with the rest by other *indicia* not obscure, *but chiefly by this*—that Philotas confessed to have heard of a conspiracy going on, without mentioning it to Alexander, though twice a day in his presence"—*καὶ τοὺς μηνυτὰς τοῦ ἔργου παρελθόντας ἐξελέγξαι Φιλώταν τε καὶ τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἄλλοις τε ἐλέγχοις οὐκ ἀφανέσι, καὶ μάλιστα δὴ ὅτι αὐτὸς Φιλώτας πεπύσθαι μὲν—συνέφη*, &c. What these other *indicia* were, we are not told; but we may see how slender was their value, when we learn that the non-revelation admitted by Philotas was stronger than any of them. The non-revelation, when we recollect that Nikomachus was the *only* informant (Arrian loosely talks of *μηνυτὰς*, as if there were more), proves absolutely nothing as to the complicity of Philotas, though it may prove something as to his indiscretion. Even on this minor charge, Curtius puts into his mouth a very sufficient exculpation. But if Alexander had taken a different view, and dismissed or even confined him for it, there would have been little room for remark.

The point upon which Arrian is at variance with Curtius, is that he states "Philotas with the rest to have been shot to death by the Macedonians"—thus, seemingly contradicting, at least by implication, the fact of his having been tortured. Now Plutarch, Diodorus, and Justin, all concur with Curtius in affirming that he was tortured. On such a matter, I prefer their united authority to that of Ptolemy and Aristobulus. These two last-mentioned authors were probably quite content

fused by Kleander, from dread of the king's displeasure. At last, however, thinking it prudent to comply in part, he cut off the head, delivering to them the trunk alone for burial. The head was sent to Alexander[1].

Fear and disgust produced by the killing of Parmenio and Philotas.

Among the many tragical deeds recounted throughout the course of this history, there is none more revolting than the fate of these two generals. Alexander, violent in all his impulses, displayed on this occasion a personal rancour worthy of his ferocious mother Olympias, exasperated rather than softened by the magnitude of past services[1]. When

to believe in the complicity of Philotas upon the authority of Alexander himself; without troubling themselves to criticise the proofs. They tell us that Alexander vehemently denounced (*κατηγορῆσαι ἰσχυρῶς*) Philotas before the assembled soldiers. After this, any mere shadow or pretence of proof would be sufficient. Moreover, let us recollect that Ptolemy obtained his promotion, to be one of the confidential *body guards* (*σωματοφύλακες*), out of this very conspiracy, real or fictitious; he was promoted to the post of the condemned Demetrius (Arrian, iii. 27, 11).

How little Ptolemy and Aristobulus cared to do justice to any one whom Alexander hated, may be seen by what they say afterwards about the philosopher Kallisthenes. Both of them affirmed that the pages, condemned for conspiracy against Alexander, deposed against Kallisthenes as having instigated them to the deed (Arrian, iv. 14, 1). Now we know, from the authority of Alexander himself, whose letters Plutarch quotes (Alexand. 55), that the pages denied the privity of any one else—maintaining the project to have been altogether their own. To their great honour, the pages persisted in this deposition, even under extreme tortures—though they knew that a deposition against Kallisthenes was desired from them.

My belief is, that Diodorus, Plutarch, Curtius, and Justin, are correct in stating that Philotas was tortured. Ptolemy and Aristobulus have thought themselves warranted in omitting this fact, which they probably had little satisfaction in reflecting upon. If Philotas was not tortured, there could have been no evidence at all against Parmenio—for the only evidence against the latter was the extorted confession of Philotas.

[1] Curtius, vii. 2, 32, 33.

[2] Contrast the conduct of Alexander towards Philotas and Parmenio,

we see the greatest officers of the Macedonian army directing in person, and under the eye of Alexander, the laceration and burning of the naked body of their colleague Philotas, and assassinating with their own hands the veteran Parmenio,—we feel how much we have passed out of the region of Greek civic feeling into that of the more savage Illyrian warrior, partially orientalised. It is not surprising to read, that Antipater, viceroy of Macedonia, who had shared with Parmenio the favour and confidence of Philip as well as of Alexander, should tremble when informed of such proceedings, and cast about for a refuge against the like possibilities to himself. Many other officers were alike alarmed and disgusted with the transactions[1]. Hence Alexander, opening and examining the letters sent home from his army to Macedonia, detected such strong expressions of indignation, that he thought it prudent to transfer many pronounced malcontents into a division by themselves, parting them off from the remaining army[2]. Instead of appointing any substitute for Philotas in the command of the Companion-cavalry, he cast that body into two divisions, nominating Hephæstion to the command of one and Kleitus to that of the other[3].

B.C. 330–329. Conquest of the Paropamisadæ, &c. Foundation of Alexandria *ad Caucasum.*

The autumn and winter were spent by Alexander in reducing Drangiana, Gedrosia, Arachosia, and the Paropamisadæ; the modern Seiestan, Afghanistan, and the western part of Kabul, lying between Ghazna

with that of Cyrus the younger towards the conspirator Orontes, as described in Xenophon, Anabas. i. 6.

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 49.

[2] Curtius, vii. 2, 36; Diodor. xvii. 80; Justin, xii. 5.

[3] Arrian, iii. 27, 8.

on the north, Kandahar or Kelat on the south, and Furrah in the west. He experienced no combined resistance, but his troops suffered severely from cold and privation[1]. Near the southern termination of one of the passes of the Hindoo-Koosh (apparently north-east of the town of Kabul) he founded a new city, called Alexandria ad Caucasum, where he planted 7000 old soldiers, Macedonians, and others as colonists[2]. Towards the close of winter

[1] Arrian, iii. 28, 2. About the geography, compare Wilson's Ariana Antiqua, p. 173-178. "By perambulator, the distance from Herat to Kandahar is 371 miles; from Kandahar to Kabul, 309 miles: total 688 miles (English)." The principal city in Drangiana (Seiestan) mentioned by the subsequent Greek geographers is, Prophthasia; existing seemingly before Alexander's arrival. See the fragments of his *mensores*, ap. Didot, Fragm. Hist. Alex. Magn. p. 135; Pliny, H. N. vi. 21. The quantity of remains of ancient cities, still to be found in this territory, is remarkable. Wilson observes this (p. 154).

[2] Arrian, iii. 28, 6; Curtius, vii. 3, 23; Diodor. xvii. 83. Alexandria in Ariis is probably Herat; Alexandria in Arachosia is probably Kandahar. But neither the one nor the other is mentioned as having been founded by *Alexander*, either in Arrian or Curtius, or Diodorus. The name Alexandria does not prove that they were founded by him; for several of the Diadochi called their own foundations by his name (Strabo, xiii. p. 593). Considering how very short a time Alexander spent in these regions, the wonder is, that he could have found time to establish those foundations which are expressly ascribed to him by Arrian and his other historians. The authority of Pliny and Steph. Byzant. is hardly sufficient to warrant us in ascribing to him more. The exact site of Alexandria ad Caucasum cannot be determined, for want of sufficient topographical data. There seems much probability that it was at the place called Beghram, twenty-five miles north-east of Kabul—in the way between Kabul on the south side of the Hindoo-Koosh, and Anderab on the north side. The prodigious number of coins and relics, Greek as well as Mahometan, discovered by Mr. Masson at Beghram, supply better evidence for identifying the site with that of Alexandria ad Caucasum, than can be pleaded on behalf of any other locality. See Masson's Narrative of Journeys in Affghanistan, &c., vol. iii. ch. 7. p. 148 *seqq.*

In crossing the Hindoo-Koosh from south to north, Alexander probably marched by the pass of Bamian, which seems the only one among the four passes open to an army in the winter. See Wood's Journey to the Oxus, p. 195.

he crossed over the mighty range of the Hindoo-Koosh; a march of fifteen days through regions of snow, and fraught with hardship to his army. On reaching the north side of these mountains, he found himself in Baktria.

Alexander crosses the Hindoo-Koosh, and conquers Baktria. Bessus is made prisoner.

The Baktrian leader Bessus, who had assumed the title of king, could muster no more than a small force, with which he laid waste the country, and then retired across the river Oxus into Sogdiana, destroying all the boats. Alexander overran Baktria with scarce any resistance; the chief places, Baktra (Balkh) and Aornos surrendering to him on the first demonstration of attack. Having named Artabazus satrap of Baktria, and placed Archelaus with a garrison in Aornos[1], he marched northward towards the river Oxus, the boundary between Baktria and Sogdiana. It was a march of extreme hardship; reaching for two or three days across a sandy desert destitute of water, and under very hot weather. The Oxus, six furlongs in breadth, deep, and rapid, was the most formidable river that the Macedonians had yet seen[2]. Alexander transported his army across it on the tent-skins inflated and stuffed with straw. It seems surprising that Bessus did not avail himself of this favourable opportunity for resisting a passage in itself so difficult; he had however been abandoned by his Baktrian cavalry at the moment when he quitted their territory. Some of his companions, Spitamenes and others, terrified

[1] Arrian, iii. 29, 3; Curtius, vii. 5, 1.

[2] Arrian, iii. 29, 4; Strabo, xi. p. 509. Evidently Ptolemy and Aristobulus were much more awe-struck with the Oxus, than with either the Tigris or the Euphrates. Arrian (iv. 6, 13) takes his standard of comparison, in regard to rivers, from the river Peneius in Thessaly.

at the news that Alexander had crossed the Oxus, were anxious to make their own peace by betraying their leader[1]. They sent a proposition to this effect; upon which Ptolemy with a light division was sent forward by Alexander, and was enabled, by extreme celerity of movements, to surprise and seize Bessus in a village. Alexander ordered that he should be held in chains, naked and with a collar round his neck, at the side of the road along which the army were marching. On reaching the spot, Alexander stopped his chariot, and sternly demanded from Bessus, on what pretence he had first arrested, and afterwards slain, his king and benefactor Darius. Bessus replied, that he had not done this single-handed; others were concerned in it along with him, to procure for themselves lenient treatment from Alexander. The king said no more, but ordered Bessus to be scourged, and then sent

[1] Curtius, vii. 5, 19. The exactness of Quintus Curtius, in describing the general features of Baktria and Sogdiana, is attested in the strongest language by modern travellers. See Burnes's Travels into Bokhara, vol. ii. ch. 8. p. 211, 2nd edit.; also Morier, Second Journey in Persia, p. 282.

But in the geographical details of the country, we are at fault. We have not sufficient data to identify more than one or two of the localities mentioned, in the narrative of Alexander's proceedings, either by Curtius or Arrian. That Marakanda is the modern Samarkand —the river Polytimetus, the modern Kohik—and Baktra or Zariaspa the modern Balkh—appears certain; but the attempts made by commentators to assign the site of other places are not such as to carry conviction.

In fact, these countries, at the present moment, are known only superficially as to their general scenery; for purposes of measurement and geography, they are almost unknown; as may be seen by any one who reads the Introduction to Erskine's translation of the Memoirs of Sultan Baber.

back as prisoner to Baktra[1]—where we shall again hear of him.

Massacre of the Branchidæ and their families, perpetrated by Alexander in Sogdiana.

In his onward march, Alexander approached a small town, inhabited by the Branchidæ; descendants of those Branchidæ near Miletus on the coast of Ionia, who had administered the great temple and oracle of Apollo on Cape Poseidion, and who had yielded up the treasures of that temple to the Persian king Xerxes, 150 years before. This surrender had brought upon them so much odium, that when the dominion of Xerxes was overthrown on the coast, they retired with him into the interior of Asia. He assigned to them lands in the distant region of Sogdiana, where their descendants had ever since remained; bilingual and partially dishellenised, yet still attached to their traditions and origin. Delighted to find themselves once more in commerce with Greeks, they poured forth to meet and welcome the army, tendering all that they possessed. Alexander, when he heard who they were and what was their parentage, desired the Milesians in his army to determine how they should be treated. But as these Milesians were neither decided nor unanimous, Alexander announced that he would determine for himself. Having first occupied the city in person with a select detachment, he posted

[1] Arrian, iii. 30, 5–10. These details are peculiarly authentic, as coming from Ptolemy, the person chiefly concerned.

Aristobulus agreed in the description of the guise in which Bessus was exhibited, but stated that he was brought up in this way by Spitamenes and Dataphernes. Curtius (vii. 24, 36) follows this version. Diodorus also gives an account very like it, mentioning nothing about Ptolemy (xvii. 83).

his army all round the walls, and then gave orders not only to plunder it, but to massacre the entire population — men, women, and children. They were slain without arms or attempt at resistance, resorting to nothing but prayers and suppliant manifestations. Alexander next commanded the walls to be levelled, and the sacred groves cut down, so that no habitable site might remain, nor any thing except solitude and sterility[1]. Such was the revenge taken upon these unhappy victims for the deeds of their ancestors in the fourth or fifth generation before. Alexander doubtless considered himself to be executing the wrath of Apollo against an accursed race who had robbed the temple of the God[2]. The Macedonian expedition had been pro-

[1] Curtius, vii. 23; Plutarch de Serâ Numinis Vindictâ, p. 557 B; Strabo, xi. p. 518; compare also xiv. p. 634, and xvii. p. 814. This last-mentioned passage of Strabo helps us to understand the peculiarly strong pious fervour with which Alexander regarded the temple and oracle of Branchidæ. At the time when Alexander went up to the oracle of Ammon in Egypt, for the purpose of affiliating himself to Zeus Ammon, there came to him envoys from Miletus, announcing that the oracle at Branchidæ, which had been silent ever since the time of Xerxes, had just begun again to give prophecy, and had certified the fact that Alexander was the son of Zeus, besides many other encouraging predictions.

The massacre of the Branchidæ by Alexander was described by Diodorus, but was contained in that portion of the seventeenth book which is lost; there is a great lacuna in the MSS. after cap. 83. The fact is distinctly indicated in the table of contents prefixed to Book xvii.

Arrian makes no mention of these descendants of the Branchidæ in Sogdiana, nor of the destruction of the town and its inhabitants by Alexander. Perhaps neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus said anything about it. Their silence is not at all difficult to explain, nor does it, in my judgement, impeach the credibility of the narrative. They do not feel under obligation to give publicity to the worst acts of their hero.

[2] The Delphian oracle pronounced, in explaining the subjugation and ruin of Krœsus king of Lydia, that he had thereby expiated the sin of his ancestor in the fifth generation before (Herodot. i. 91: compare vi. 86).

claimed to be undertaken originally for the purpose of revenging upon the contemporary Persians the ancient wrongs done to Greece by Xerxes; so that Alexander would follow out the same sentiment in revenging upon the contemporary Branchidæ the acts of their ancestors — yet more guilty than Xerxes, in his belief. The massacre of this unfortunate population was in fact an example of human sacrifice on the largest scale, offered to the Gods by the religious impulses of Alexander, and worthy to be compared to that of the Carthaginian general Hannibal, when he sacrificed 3000 Grecian prisoners on the field of Himera, where his grandfather Hamilkar had been slain seventy years before[1].

Alexander at Marakanda and on the Jaxartes. Foundation of Alexandria on the Jaxartes. Limit of Alexander's progress northward.

Alexander then continued his onward progress, first to Marakanda (Samarcand), the chief town of Sogdiana—next, to the river Jaxartes, which he and his companions, in their imperfect geographical notions, believed to be the Tanais, the boundary between Asia and Europe[2]. In his march, he left

Immediately before the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war, the Lacedæmonians called upon the Athenians to expel the descendants of those who had taken part in the Kylonian sacrilege, 180 years before; they addressed this injunction with a view to procure the banishment of Perikles, yet still τοῖς θεοῖς πρῶτον τιμωροῦντες (Thucyd. i. 125-127).

The idea that the sins of fathers were visited upon their descendants, even to the third and fourth generation, had great currency in the ancient world.

[1] Diodor. xiii. 62. See Vol. X. Ch. lxxxi. p. 571 of this History.

[2] Pliny, H. N. vi. 16. In the Meteorologica of Aristotle (i. 13, 15-18) we read that the rivers Baktrus, Choaspes, and Araxes flowed from the lofty mountain Parnasus (Paropamisus?) in Asia; and that the Araxes bifurcated, one branch forming the Tanais, which fell into the Palus Mæotis. For this fact he refers to the γῆς περιόδοι current in his time. It seems plain that by the Araxes Aristotle must mean the Jaxartes. We see therefore that Alexander and his companions, in identifying the

garrisons in various towns[1], but experienced no resistance, though detached bodies of the natives hovered on his flanks. Some of these bodies, having cut off a few of his foragers, took refuge afterwards on a steep and rugged mountain, conceived to be unassailable. Thither however Alexander pursued them, at the head of his lightest and most active troops. Though at first repulsed, he succeeded in scaling and capturing the place. Of its defenders, thirty thousand in number, three fourths were either put to the sword, or perished in jumping down the precipices. Several of his soldiers were wounded with arrows, and he himself received a shot from one of them through his leg[2]. But here, as elsewhere, we perceive that nearly all the Orientals whom Alexander subdued were men little suited for close combat hand to hand,—fighting only with missiles.

B.C. 329, summer. Foundation of Alexandria *ad Jaxartem*. Limit of march northward.

Here, on the river Jaxartes, Alexander projected the foundation of a new city to bear his name; intended partly as a protection against incursions from the Scythian Nomads on the other side of the river, partly as a facility for himself to cross over and subdue them, which he intended to do as soon as he could find opportunity[3]. He was however called off for the time by the news of a wide-spread revolt among the newly-conquered inhabitants both of Sogdiana and Baktria. He suppressed the re-

Jaxartes with the Tanais, only followed the geographical descriptions and ideas current in their time. Humboldt remarks several cases in which the Greek geographers were fond of supposing bifurcation of rivers (Asie Centrale, vol. ii. p. 291).

[1] Arrian, iv. 1, 5. Arrian, iii. 30, 17.

[3] Arrian, iv. 1, 3.

volt with his habitual vigour and celerity, distributing his troops so as to capture five townships in two days, and Kyropolis or Kyra, the largest of the neighbouring Sogdian towns (founded by the Persian Cyrus), immediately afterwards. He put all the defenders and inhabitants to the sword. Returning then to the Jaxartes, he completed in twenty days the fortifications of his new town of Alexandria (perhaps at or near Khodjend), with suitable sacrifices and festivities to the Gods. He planted in it some Macedonian veterans and Grecian mercenaries, together with volunteer settlers from the natives around[1]. An army of Scythian Nomads, showing themselves on the other side of the river, piqued his vanity to cross over and attack them. Carrying over a division of his army on inflated skins, he defeated them with little difficulty, pursuing them briskly into the desert. But the weather was intensely hot, and the army suffered much from thirst; while the little water to be found was so bad, that it brought upon Alexander a diarrhœa which endangered his life[2]. This chase, of a few miles on the right bank of the Jaxartes (seemingly in the present Khanat of Kokand), marked the utmost limit of Alexander's progress northward.

B.C. 329–328, winter. Alexander at Zariaspa in Baktria —he causes Bessus to be mutilated and slain.

Shortly afterwards, a Macedonian detachment, unskilfully conducted, was destroyed in Sogdiana by Spitamenes and the Scythians: a rare misfortune, which Alexander avenged by overrunning the region[3] near the river Polytimétus (the Kohik),

[1] Arrian, iv. 3, 17; Curtius, vii. 6, 25.

[2] Arrian, iv. 5, 6; Curtius, vii. 9.

[3] Arrian, iv. 6, 11; Curtius, vii. 9, 22. The river, called by the Ma-

and putting to the sword the inhabitants of all the towns which he took. He then recrossed the Oxus, to rest during the extreme season of winter at Zariaspa in Baktria, from whence his communications with the West and with Macedonia were more easy; and where he received various reinforcements of Greek troops[1]. Bessus, who had been here retained as a prisoner, was now brought forward amidst a public assembly; wherein Alexander, having first reproached him for his treason to Darius, caused his nose and ears to be cut off—and sent him in this condition to Ekbatana, to be finally slain by the Medes and Persians[2]. Mutilation was a practice altogether Oriental and non-Hellenic: even Arrian, admiring and indulgent as he is towards his hero, censures this savage order, as one among many proofs how much Alexander had taken on Oriental dispositions. We may remark that his extreme wrath on this occasion was founded partly on disappointment that Bessus had frustrated his toilsome efforts for taking Darius alive—partly on the fact that the satrap had committed treason against the king's person, which it was the policy as well as the feeling of Alexander to surround with a circle of Deity[3]. For as to traitors against Persia,

cedonians Polytimetus (Strabo, xi. p. 518), now bears the name of Kohik or Zurufshan. It rises in the mountains east of Samarkand, and flowing westward on the north of that city and of Bokhara. It does not reach so far as the Oxus; during the full time of the year, it falls into a lake called Karakul; during the dry months, it is lost in the sands, as Arrian states (Burnes's Travels, vol. ii. ch. xi. p. 299. ed. 2nd.).

[1] Arrian, iv. 7, 1; Curtius, vii. 10, 12.

[2] Arrian, iv. 7, 5.

[3] After describing the scene at Rome, when the Emperor Galba was

as a cause and country, Alexander had never discouraged, and had sometimes signally recompensed them. Mithrines, the governor of Sardis, who opened to him the gates of that almost impregnable fortress immediately after the battle of the Granikus —the traitor who perhaps, next to Darius himself, had done most harm to the Persian cause—obtained from him high favour and promotion[1].

B.C. 328, summer. Farther subjugation of Baktria and Sogdiana. Halt at Marakanda.

The rude, but spirited tribes of Baktria and Sogdiana were as yet but imperfectly subdued, seconded as their resistance was by wide spaces of sandy desert, by the neighbourhood of the Scythian Nomads, and by the presence of Spitamenes as a leader. Alexander, distributing his army into five divisions, traversed the country and put down all resistance, while he also took measures for establishing several military posts, or new towns, in convenient places[2]. After some time the whole army was reunited at the chief place of Sogdiana—Marakanda—where some halt and repose was given[3].

deposed and assassinated in the forum, Tacitus observes—"Plures quam centum et viginti libellos præmia exposcentium, ob aliquam notabilem illâ die operam, Vitellius posteà invenit, omnesque conquiri et interfici jussit: *non honore Galbæ, sed tradito principibus more, munimentum ad præsens, in posterum ultionem*" (Tacitus, Hist. i. 44).

[1] Arrian, i. 17, 3; iii. 16, 8. Curtius, iii. 12, 6; v. 1, 44.

[2] Curtius (vii. 10, 15) mentions six cities (oppida) founded by Alexander in these regions; apparently somewhere north of the Oxus, but the sites cannot be made out. Justin (xii. 5) alludes to twelve foundations in Baktria and Sogdiana.

[3] Arrian, iv. 16, 4; Curtius, vii. 10, 1. "Sogdiana regio magnâ ex parte deserta est; octingenta ferè stadia in latitudinem vastæ solitudines tenent."

Respecting the same country (Sogdiana and Baktria), Mr. Erskine observes (Introduction to the Memoirs of Sultan Baber, p. xliii.):—

"The face of the country is extremely broken, and divided by lofty hills; even the plains are diversified by great varieties of soil,—some

During this halt at Marakanda (Samarcand) the memorable banquet occurred wherein Alexander murdered Kleitus. It has been already related that Kleitus had saved his life at the battle of the Granikus, by cutting off the sword arm of the Persian Spithridates when already uplifted to strike him from behind. Since the death of Philotas, the important function of general of the Companion-cavalry had been divided between Hephæstion and Kleitus. Moreover the family of Kleitus had been attached to Philip, by ties so ancient, that his sister, Lanikê, had been selected as the nurse of Alexander himself when a child. Two of her sons had already perished in the Asiatic battles. If therefore there were any man who stood high in the service, or was privileged to speak his mind freely to Alexander, it was Kleitus.

B.C. 328.

Banquet at Marakanda. Character and position of Kleitus.

In this banquet at Marakanda, when wine, according to the Macedonian habit, had been abundantly drunk, and when Alexander, Kleitus, and most of the other guests were already nearly intoxicated, enthusiasts or flatterers heaped immoderate eulogies upon the king's past achievements[1]. They exalted him above all the most venerated legendary

Boasts of Alexander and his flatterers—repugnance of Macedonian officers felt, but not expressed.

extensive districts along the Kohik river, nearly the whole of Ferghana (along the Jaxartes), the greater part of Kwarizm along the branches of the Oxus, with the large portions of Balkh, Badakshan, Kesh, and Hissar, being of uncommon fertility; while the greater part of the rest is a barren waste, and in some places a sandy desert. Indeed the whole country north of the Oxus has a decided tendency to degenerate into desert; and many of its most fruitful spaces are nearly surrounded by barren sands; so that the population of all these districts still, as in the time of Baber, consists of the fixed inhabitants of the cities and fertile lands, and of the unsettled and roving wanderers of the desert, who dwell in tents of felt, and live on the produce of their flocks."

[1] Arrian, iv. 8, 7.

heroes; they proclaimed that his superhuman deeds proved his divine paternity, and that he had earned an apotheosis like Herakles, which nothing but envy could withhold from him even during his life. Alexander himself joined in these boasts, and even took credit for the later victories of the reign of his father, whose abilities and glory he depreciated. To the old Macedonian officers, such an insult cast on the memory of Philip was deeply offensive. But among them all, none had been more indignant than Kleitus, with the growing insolence of Alexander—his assumed filiation from Zeus Ammon, which put aside Philip as unworthy—his preference for Persian attendants, who granted or refused admittance to his person—his extending to Macedonian soldiers the contemptuous treatment habitually endured by Asiatics, and even allowing them to be scourged by Persian hands and Persian rods[1]. The pride of a Macedonian general in the stupendous successes of the last five years, was effaced by his mortification when he saw that they tended only to merge his countrymen amidst a crowd of servile Asiatics, and to inflame the prince with high-flown aspirations transmitted from Xerxes or Ochus. But whatever might be the internal thoughts of Macedonian officers, they held their peace before Alexander, whose formidable character and exorbitant self-estimation would tolerate no criticism.

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 51. Nothing can be more touching than the words put by Plutarch into the mouth of Kleitus—Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ νῦν χαίρομεν, Ἀλέξανδρε, τοιαῦτα τέλη τῶν πόνων κομιζόμενοι, μακαρίζομεν δὲ τοὺς ἤδη τεθνηκότας πρὶν ἐπιδεῖν Μηδικαῖς ῥάβδοις ξαινομένους Μακεδόνας, καὶ Περσῶν δεομένους ἵνα τῷ βασιλεῖ προσέλθωμεν.

Scene at the banquet —vehement remonstrance of Kleitus.

At the banquet of Marakanda, this long-suppressed repugnance found an issue, accidental indeed and unpremeditated, but for that very reason all the more violent and unmeasured. The wine, which made Alexander more boastful and his flatterers fulsome to excess, overpowered altogether the reserve of Kleitus. He rebuked the impiety of those who degraded the ancient heroes in order to make a pedestal for Alexander. He protested against the injustice of disparaging the exalted and legitimate fame of Philip; whose achievements he loudly extolled, pronouncing them to be equal, and even superior, to those of his son. For the exploits of Alexander, splendid as they were, had been accomplished, not by himself alone, but by that unconquerable Macedonian force which he had found ready made to his hands[1]; whereas those of Philip had been his own—since he had found Macedonia prostrate and disorganised, and had had to create for himself both soldiers, and a military system. The great instruments of Alexander's victories had been Philip's old soldiers, whom he now despised —and among them Parmenio, whom he had put to death.

Furious wrath of Alexander —he murders Kleitus.

Remarks such as these, poured forth in the coarse language of a half-intoxicated Macedonian veteran, provoked loud contradiction from many, and gave poignant offence to Alexander; who now for the first time heard the open outburst of disapprobation, before concealed and known to him only by surmise. But wrath and contradiction, both

[1] Arrian, iv. 8, 8. *οὔκουν μόνον γε* (Ἀλέξανδρον) *καταπρᾶξαι αὐτὰ, ἀλλὰ τὸ γὰρ πολὺ μέρος Μακεδόνων εἶναι τὰ ἔργα*, &c.

from him and from others, only made Kleitus more reckless in the outpouring of his own feelings, now discharged with delight after having been so long pent up. He passed from the old Macedonian soldiers to himself individually. Stretching forth his right hand towards Alexander, he exclaimed—"Recollect that you owe your life to me; this hand preserved you at the Granikus. Listen to the outspoken language of truth, or else abstain from asking freemen to supper, and confine yourself to the society of barbaric slaves." All these reproaches stung Alexander to the quick. But nothing was so intolerable to him as the respectful sympathy for Parmenio, which brought to his memory one of the blackest deeds of his life—and the reminiscence of his preservation at the Granikus, which lowered him into the position of a debtor towards the very censor under whose reproof he was now smarting. At length wrath and intoxication together drove him into uncontrollable fury. He started from his couch, and felt for his dagger to spring at Kleitus; but the dagger had been put out of reach by one of his attendants. In a loud voice and with the Macedonian word of command, he summoned the body guards and ordered the trumpeter to sound an alarm. But no one obeyed so grave an order, given in his condition of drunkenness. His principal officers, Ptolemy, Perdikkas and others, clung round him, held his arms and body, and besought him to abstain from violence; others at the same time tried to silence Kleitus and hurry him out of the hall, which had now become a scene of tumult and consternation. But Kleitus was not in a humour

to confess himself in the wrong by retiring; while Alexander, furious at the opposition now, for the first time, offered to his will, exclaimed, that his officers held him in chains as Bessus had held Darius, and left him nothing but the name of a king. Though anxious to restrain his movements, they doubtless did not dare to employ much physical force; so that his great personal strength, and continued efforts, presently set him free. He then snatched a pike from one of the soldiers, rushed upon Kleitus, and thrust him through on the spot, exclaiming, "Go now to Philip and Parmenio[1]."

[1] Arrian, iv. 8; Curtius, viii. 1; Plutarch, Alexand. 50, 51; Justin, xii. 6. The description given by Diodorus was contained in the lost part of his seventeenth book; the table of contents, prefixed thereunto, notes the incident briefly.

All the authors describe in the same general way the commencement, progress, and result, of this impressive scene in the banqueting hall of Marakanda; but they differ materially in the details. In giving what seems to me the most probable account, I have borrowed partly from all, yet following mostly the account given by Arrian from Ptolemy, himself present. For Arrian's narrative down to sect. 14 of c. 8 (before the words Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ) may fairly be presumed to be derived from Ptolemy.

Both Plutarch and Curtius describe the scene in a manner more dishonourable to Alexander than Arrian; and at the same time (in my judgement) less probable. Plutarch says that the brawl took its rise from a poet named Pierion singing a song which turned into derision those Macedonians who had been recently defeated in Sogdiana; that Alexander and those around him greatly applauded this satire; that Kleitus protested against such an insult to soldiers, who, though unfortunate, had behaved with unimpeachable bravery; that Alexander then turned upon Kleitus saying, that he was seeking an excuse for himself by extenuating cowardice in others; that Kleitus retorted by reminding him of the preservation of his life at the Granikus. Alexander is thus made to provoke the quarrel by aspersing the courage of Kleitus, which I think noway probable; nor would he be likely to encourage a song of that tenor.

Curtius agrees with Arrian in ascribing the origin of the mischief to the extravagant boasts of Alexander and his flatterers, and to their de-

Intense remorse of Alexander, immediately after the deed.

No sooner was the deed perpetrated, than the feelings of Alexander underwent an entire revolution. The spectacle of Kleitus, a bleeding corpse on the floor,—the marks of stupefaction and horror evident in all the spectators, and the reaction from a furious impulse instantaneously satiated—plunged him at once into the opposite extreme of remorse and self-condemnation. Hastening out of the hall, and retiring to bed, he passed three days in an agony of distress, without food or drink. He burst into tears and multiplied exclamations on his own mad act; he dwelt upon the names of Kleitus and

preciation of Philip. He then tells us that Kleitus, on hearing their unseemly talk, turned round and whispered to his neighbour some lines out of the Andromachê of Euripides (which lines Plutarch also ascribes to him, though at a later moment); that Alexander, not hearing the words, asked what had been said, but no one would tell him; at length Kleitus himself repeated the sentiment in language of his own. This would suit a literary Greek; but an old Macedonian officer half intoxicated, when animated by a vehement sentiment, would hardly express it by whispering a Greek poetical quotation to his neighbour. He would either hold his tongue, or speak what he felt broadly and directly. Nevertheless Curtius has stated two points very material to the case, which do not appear in Arrian. 1. It was Alexander himself, not his flatterers, who vilipended Philip; at least the flatterers only did so, after him, and following his example. The topic would be dangerous for them to originate, and might easily be carried too far. 2. Among all the topics touched upon by Kleitus, none was so intolerable as the open expression of sympathy, friendship, and regret, for Parmenio. This stung Alexander in the sorest point of his conscience; he must have known that there were many present who sympathised with it; and it was probably the main cause which worked him up to phrenzy. Moreover we may be pretty sure that Kleitus, while expatiating upon Philip, would not forget Philip's general in chief and his own old friend, Parmenio.

I cannot believe the statement of Aristobulus, that Kleitus was forced by his friends out of the hall, and afterwards returned to it of his own accord, to defy Alexander once more. It seems plain from Arrian, that Ptolemy said no such thing. The murderous impulse of Alexander was gratified on the spot, and without delay, as soon as he got clear from the gentle restraint of his surrounding friends.

Lanikê with the debt of gratitude which he owed to each, and denounced himself as unworthy to live after having requited such services with a foul murder[1]. His friends at length prevailed on him to take food, and return to activity. All joined in trying to restore his self-satisfaction. The Macedonian army passed a public vote that Kleitus had been justly slain, and that his body should remain unburied; which afforded opportunity to Alexander to reverse the vote, and to direct that it should be buried by his own order[2]. The prophets comforted him by the assurance that his murderous impulse had arisen, not from his own natural mind, but from a maddening perversion intentionally brought on by the God Dionysus, to avenge the omission of a sacrifice due to him on the day of the banquet, but withheld[3]. Lastly, the Greek sophist or philosopher, Anaxarchus of Abdera, revived Alexander's spirits by well-timed flattery, treating his sensibility as nothing better than generous weakness; reminding

[1] Arrian, iv. 9, 4; Curtius, viii. 2, 2.

[2] Curtius, viii. 2, 12. "Quoque minus cædis puderet, jure interfectum Clitum Macedones decernunt; sepulturâ quoque prohibituri, ni rex humari jussisset."

In explanation of this monstrous verdict of the soldiers, we must recollect that the safety of the whole army (now at Samarcand, almost beyond the boundary of inhabited regions, ἔξω τῆς οἰκουμένης) was felt to depend on the life of Alexander. Compare Justin, xii. 6, 15.

[3] Arrian, iv. 9, 6. Alexander imagined himself to have incurred the displeasure of Dionysus by having sacked and destroyed the city of Thebes, the supposed birth-place and favourite locality of that god (Plutarch, Alex. 13).

The maddening delusion brought upon men by the wrath of Dionysus is awfully depicted in the Bacchæ of Euripides. Under the influence of that delusion, Agavê, mother of Pentheus, tears her son in pieces and bears away his head in triumph, not knowing what is in her hands. Compare also Euripid. Hippolyt. 440–1412.

him that in his exalted position of conqueror and Great King, he was entitled to prescribe what was right and just, instead of submitting himself to laws dictated from without[1]. Kallisthenes the philosopher was also summoned, along with Anaxarchus, to the king's presence, for the same purpose of offering consolatory reflections. But he is said to have adopted a tone of discourse altogether different, and to have given offence rather than satisfaction to Alexander.

To such remedial influences, and probably still more to the absolute necessity for action, Alexander's remorse at length yielded. Like the other emotions of his fiery soul, it was violent and overpowering while it lasted. But it cannot be shown to have left any durable trace on his character, nor any effects justifying the unbounded admiration of Arrian; who has little but blame to bestow on the murdered Kleitus, while he expresses the strongest sympathy for the mental suffering of the murderer.

B.C. 328. Active and successful operations of Alexander in Sogdiana.

After ten days[2], Alexander again put his army in motion, to complete the subjugation of Sogdiana. He found no enemy capable of meeting him in pitched battle; yet Spitamenes, with the Sogdians and some Scythian allies, raised much hostility of detail, which it cost another year to put down. Alexander underwent the greatest fatigue and hardships in his marches through the mountainous parts of this wide, rugged, and poorly supplied country, with rocky positions, strong by nature,

[1] Arrian, iv. 9, 10; Plutarch, Alex. 52.

[2] Curtius, viii. 2, 13—"decem diebus ad confirmandum pudorem apud Maracanda consumptis," &c.

which his enemies sought to defend. One of these fastnesses, held by a native chief named Sisymithres, seemed almost unattackable, and was indeed taken rather by intimidation than by actual force[1]. The Scythians, after a partial success over a small Macedonian detachment, were at length so thoroughly beaten and overawed, that they slew Spitamenes and sent his head to the conqueror as a propitiatory offering[2].

B.C. 328–327, winter, spring.

Capture of two inexpugnable positions—the Sogdian rock—the rock of Choriênes.

Passion of Alexander for Roxana.

After a short rest at Naütaka during the extreme winter, Alexander resumed operations, by attacking a strong post called the Sogdian Rock, whither a large number of fugitives had assembled, with an ample supply of provision. It was a precipice supposed to be inexpugnable; and would seemingly have proved so, in spite of the energy and abilities of Alexander, had not the occupants altogether neglected their guard, and yielded at the mere sight of a handful of Macedonians who had scrambled up the precipice. Among the captives, taken by Alexander on this rock, were the wife and family of the Baktrian chief Oxyartes; one of whose daughters, named Roxana, so captivated Alexander by her beauty that he resolved to make her his wife[3]. He then passed out of Sogdiana into the neighbouring territory Parætakênê, where there was another inexpugnable site called the Rock of Choriênes, which he was also fortunate enough to reduce[4].

From hence Alexander went to Baktra. Sending

B.C. 327.

[1] Curtius, viii. 2, 20-30.

[2] Arrian, iv. 17, 11. Curtius (viii. 3) gives a different narrative of the death of Spitamenes.

[3] Arrian, iv. 18, 19.

[4] Arrian, iv. 21. Our geographical knowledge does not enable us to verify these localities, or to follow Alexander in his marches of detail.

Kraterus with a division to put the last hand to the reduction of Parætakênê, he himself remained at Baktra, preparing for his expedition across the Hindoo-Koosh to the conquest of India. As a security for the tranquillity of Baktria and Sogdiana during his absence, he levied 30,000 young soldiers from those countries to accompany him[1].

B.C. 327, spring. Alexander at Baktra—marriage with Roxana. His demand for prostration or worship from all.

It was at Baktra that Alexander celebrated his marriage with the captive Roxana. Amidst the repose and festivities connected with that event, the Oriental temper which he was now acquiring displayed itself more forcibly than ever. He could no longer be satisfied without obtaining prostration, or worship, from Greeks and Macedonians as well as from Persians; a public and unanimous recognition of his divine origin and superhuman dignity. Some Greeks and Macedonians had already rendered to him this homage. Nevertheless to the greater number, in spite of their extreme deference and admiration for him, it was repugnant and degrading. Even the imperious Alexander shrank from issuing public and formal orders on such a subject; but a manœuvre was concerted, with his privity, by the Persians and certain compliant Greek sophists or philosophers, for the purpose of carrying the point by surprise.

Public harangue of Anaxarchus during a banquet, exhorting every one to render this worship.

During a banquet at Baktra, the philosopher Anaxarchus, addressing the assembly in a prepared harangue, extolled Alexander's exploits as greatly surpassing those of Dionysus and Herakles. He proclaimed that Alexander had already done more than enough to establish a title to divine honours from

[1] Curtius, viii. 5, 1; Arrian, iv. 22, 2.

the Macedonians; who (he said) would assuredly worship Alexander after his death, and ought in justice to worship him during his life, forthwith[1].

This harangue was applauded, and similar sentiments were enforced, by others favourable to the plan; who proceeded to set the example of immediate compliance, and were themselves the first to tender worship. Most of the Macedonian officers sat unmoved, disgusted at the speech. But though disgusted, they said nothing. To reply to a speech doubtless well-turned and flowing, required some powers of oratory; moreover, it was well known that whoever dared to reply stood marked out for the antipathy of Alexander. The fate of Kleitus, who had arraigned the same sentiments in the banqueting hall of Marakanda, was fresh in the recollection of every one. The repugnance which many felt, but none ventured to express, at length found an organ in Kallisthenes of Olynthus.

Public reply of Kallisthenes, opposing it. Character and history of Kallisthenes.

This philosopher, whose melancholy fate imparts a peculiar interest to his name, was nephew of Aristotle, and had enjoyed through his uncle an early acquaintance with Alexander, during the boyhood of the latter. At the recommendation of Aristotle, Kallisthenes had accompanied Alexander in his Asiatic expedition. He was a man of much literary and rhetorical talent, which he turned towards the composition of history—and to the history of recent times[2]. Alexander, full of ardour for conquest,

[1] Arrian, iv. 10, 7-9. Curtius (viii. 5, 9-13) represents the speech proposing divine honours to have been delivered, not by Anaxarchus, but by another lettered Greek, a Sicilian named Kleon. The tenor of the speech is substantially the same, as given by both authors.

[2] Kallisthenes had composed three historical works—1. Hellenica—

was at the same time anxious that his achievements should be commemorated by poets and men of letters[1]; there were seasons also when he enjoyed their conversation. On both these grounds, he invited several of them to accompany the army. The more prudent among them declined, but Kallisthenes obeyed, partly in hopes of procuring the reconstitution of his native city Olynthus, as Aristotle had obtained the like favour for Stageira[2]. Kallisthenes had composed a narrative (not preserved) of Alexander's exploits, which certainly reached to the battle of Arbela, and may perhaps have gone down farther. The few fragments of this narrative remaining seem to betoken extreme admiration, not merely of the bravery and ability, but also of the transcendent and unbroken good fortune, of Alexander—marking him out as the chosen favourite of the Gods. This feeling was perfectly natural under the grandeur of the events. Insofar as as we can judge from one or two specimens, Kallisthenes was full of complimentary tribute to the hero of his history. But the character of Alexander himself had undergone a material change during the six years between his first landing in Asia and his campaign in Sogdiana. All his worst

from the year 387–357 B.C. 2. History of the Sacred War—from 357–346 B.C. 3. Τὰ κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον. His style is said by Cicero to have been rhetorical; but the Alexandrine critics included him in their Canon of Historians. See Didot, Fragm. Hist. Alex. Magn. p. 6–9.

[1] See the observation ascribed to him, expressing envy towards Achilles for having been immortalised by Homer (Arrian, i. 12, 2).

[2] It is said that Ephorus, Xenokrates, and Menedemus, all declined the invitation of Alexander (Plutarch, De Stoicorum Repugnantiis, p. 1043). Respecting Menedemus, the fact can hardly be so; he must have been then too young to be invited.

qualities had been developed by unparalleled success and by Asiatic example. He required larger doses of flattery, and had now come to thirst, not merely for the reputation of divine paternity, but for the actual manifestations of worship as towards a God.

To the literary Greeks who accompanied Alexander, this change in his temper must have been especially palpable and full of serious consequence; since it was chiefly manifested, not at periods of active military duty, but at his hours of leisure, when he recreated himself by their conversation and discourses. Several of these Greeks—Anaxarchus, Kleon, the poet Agis of Argos—accommodated themselves to the change, and wound up their flatteries to the pitch required. Kallisthenes could not do so. He was a man of sedate character, of simple, severe, and almost unsocial habits—to whose sobriety the long Macedonian potations were distasteful. Aristotle said of him, that he was a great and powerful speaker, but that he had no judgment; according to other reports, he was a vain and arrogant man, who boasted that Alexander's reputation and immortality were dependent on the composition and tone of *his* history[1]. Of personal vanity,—a

[1] Arrian, iv. 10, 2; Plutarch, Alex. 53, 54. It is remarkable that Timæus denounced Kallisthenes as having in his historical work flattered Alexander to excess (Polybius, xii. 12). Kallisthenes seems to have recognised various special interpositions of the Gods, to aid Alexander's successes—see Fragments 25 and 36 of the Fragmenta Callisthenis in the edition of Didot.

In reading the censure which Arrian passes on the arrogant pretensions of Kallisthenes, we ought at the same time to read the pretensions raised by Arrian on his own behalf as an historian (i. 12, 7-9)—καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε οὐκ ἀπαξιῶ ἐμαυτὸν τῶν πρώτων ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Ἑλλάδι, εἴπερ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις, &c. I doubt much whether Kallisthenes pitched his self-estimation so high. In this chapter, Arrian

common quality among literary Greeks,—Kallisthenes probably had his full share. But there is no ground for believing that *his* character had altered. Whatever his vanity may have been, it had given no offence to Alexander during the earlier years, nor would it have given offence now, had not Alexander himself become a different man.

The reply of Kallisthenes is favourably heard by the guests—the proposition for worship is dropped.

On occasion of the demonstration led up by Anaxarchus at the banquet, Kallisthenes had been invited by Hephæstion to join in the worship intended to be proposed towards Alexander; and Hephæstion afterwards alleged, that he had promised to comply[1]. But his actual conduct affords reasonable ground for believing that he made no such promise: for he not only thought it his duty to refuse the act of worship, but also to state publicly his reasons for disapproving it; the more so, as he perceived that most of the Macedonians present felt like himself. He contended that the distinction between Gods and men was one which could not be confounded without impiety and wrong. Alexander had amply earned,—as a man, a general, and a king,—the highest honours compatible with humanity;

recounts, that Alexander envied Achilles for having been fortunate enough to obtain such a poet as Homer for panegyrist; and Arrian laments that Alexander had not, as yet, found an historian equal to his deserts. This, in point of fact, is a re-assertion of the same truth which Kallisthenes stands condemned for asserting—that the fame even of the greatest warrior depends upon his commemorators. The boastfulness of a poet is at least pardonable, when he exclaims, like Theokritus, Idyll. xvi. 73—

Ἔσσεται οὗτος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐμεῦ κεχρήσετ' ἀοιδῶ,
Ῥέξας ἢ Ἀχιλεὺς ὅσσον μέγας, ἢ βαρὺς Αἴας
Ἐν πεδίῳ Σιμόεντος, ὅθι Φρυγὸς ἠρίον Ἴλου.

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 55.

but to exalt him into a God would be both an injury to him, and an offence to the Gods. Anaxarchus (he said) was the last person from whom such a proposition ought to come, because he was one of those whose only title to Alexander's society was founded upon his capacity to give instructive and wholesome counsel[1].

Coldness and disfavour of Alexander towards Kallisthenes.

Kallisthenes here spoke out, what numbers of his hearers felt. The speech was not only approved, but so warmly applauded by the Macedonians present, especially the older officers,—that Alexander thought it prudent to forbid all farther discussion upon this delicate subject. Presently the Persians present, according to Asiatic custom, approached him and performed their prostration; after which Alexander pledged, in successive goblets of wine, those Greeks and Macedonians with whom he had held previous concert. To each of them the goblet was handed, and each, after drinking to answer the pledge, approached the King, made his prostration, and then received a salute. Lastly, Alexander sent the pledge to Kallisthenes, who, after drinking like the rest, approached him, for the purpose of receiving the salute, but without any prostration. Of this omission Alexander was expressly informed by one of the Companions; upon which he declined to admit Kallisthenes to a salute. The latter retired, observing, "Then I shall go away, worse off than others as far as the salute goes[2]."

Honourable frankness and courage of Kallisthenes.

Kallisthenes was imprudent, and even blameable, in making this last observation, which without any

[1] Arrian, iv. 11. ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ τε καὶ παιδεύσει Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συνόντα.

[2] Arrian, iv. 12, 7. φιλήματι ἔλαττον ἔχων ἄπειμι.

necessity or advantage, aggravated the offence already given to Alexander. He was more imprudent still, if we look simply to his own personal safety, in standing forward publicly to protest against the suggestion for rendering divine honours to that prince, and in thus creating the main offence which even in itself was inexpiable. But here the occasion was one serious and important, so as to convert the imprudence into an act of genuine moral courage. The question was, not about obeying an order given by Alexander, for no order had been given—but about accepting or rejecting a motion made by Anaxarchus; which Alexander, by a shabby preconcerted manœuvre, affected to leave to the free decision of the assembly, in full confidence that no one would be found intrepid enough to oppose it. If one Greek sophist made a proposition, in itself servile and disgraceful, another sophist could do himself nothing but honour by entering public protest against it; more especially since this was done (as we may see by the report in Arrian) in terms noway insulting, but full of respectful admiration, towards Alexander personally. The perfect success of the speech is in itself a proof of the propriety of its tone[1]; for the Macedonian officers would feel indifference, if not contempt, towards a rhetor like Kallisthenes, while towards Alexander they had the greatest deference short of actual worship. There are few occasions

[1] Arrian, iv. 12, 1. *ἀνιᾶσαι μὲν μεγαλωστὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, Μακεδόσι δὲ πρὸς θυμοῦ εἰπεῖν.....*

Curtius, viii. 5, 20. "Æquis auribus Callisthenes velut vindex publicæ libertatis audiebatur. Expresserat non assensionem modo, sed etiam vocem, seniorum præcipuè, quibus gravis erat inveterati moris externa mutatio."

on which the free spirit of Greek letters and Greek citizenship, in their protest against exorbitant individual insolence, appears more conspicuous and estimable than in the speech of Kallisthenes[1]. Arrian disapproves the purpose of Alexander, and strongly blames the motion of Anaxarchus; nevertheless such is his anxiety to find some excuse for Alexander, that he also blames Kallisthenes for unseasonable frankness, folly, and insolence, in offering opposition. He might have said with some truth, that Kallisthenes would have done well to withdraw earlier (if indeed he could have withdrawn without offence) from the camp of Alexander, in which no lettered Greek could now associate without abnegating his freedom of speech and sentiment, and emulating the servility of Anaxarchus. But being present, as Kallisthenes was, in the hall at Baktra when the proposition of Anaxarchus was made, and when silence would have been assent—his protest against it was both seasonable and dignified; and all the more dignified for being fraught with danger to himself.

Kallisthenes knew that danger well, and was quickly enabled to recognize it in the altered demea-

[1] There was no sentiment more deeply rooted in the free Grecian mind, prior to Alexander's conquests, than the repugnance to arrogant aspirations on the part of the fortunate man, swelling himself above the limits of humanity—and the belief that such aspirations were followed by the Nemesis of the Gods. In the dying speech which Xenophon puts into the mouth of Cyrus the Great, we find—"Ye Gods, I thank you much, that I have been sensible of your care for me, and that I have never in my successes raised my thoughts above the measure of man" (Cyropæd. viii. 7, 3). Among the most striking illustrations of this sentiment is, the story of Solon and Crœsus (Herodot. i. 32–34).

I shall recount in the next chapter examples of monstrous flattery on the part of the Athenians, proving how this sentiment expired with their freedom.

Kallisthenes becomes odious to Alexander.

nour of Alexander towards him. He was, from that day, a marked man in two senses: first, to Alexander himself, as well as to the rival sophists and all promoters of the intended deification,—for hatred, and for getting up some accusatory pretence such as might serve to ruin him; next, to the more free-spirited Macedonians, indignant witnesses of Alexander's increased insolence, and admirers of the courageous Greek who had protested against the motion of Anaxarchus. By such men he was doubtless much extolled; which praises aggravated his danger, as they were sure to be reported to Alexander. The pretext for his ruin was not long wanting.

Conspiracy of the royal pages against Alexander's life—it is divulged—they are put to torture, but implicate no one else: they are put to death.

Among those who admired and sought the conversation of Kallisthenes, was Hermolaus, one of the royal pages,—the band, selected from noble Macedonian families, who did duty about the person of the king. It had happened that this young man, one of Alexander's companions in the chase, on seeing a wild boar rushing up to attack the king, darted his javelin, and slew the animal. Alexander, angry to be anticipated in killing the boar, ordered Hermolaus to be scourged before all the other pages, and deprived him of his horse[1]. Thus humiliated and outraged—for an act not merely innocent, but the omission of which, if Alexander had sustained any injury from the boar, might have been held punishable—Hermolaus became resolutely bent on revenge[2]. He enlisted in the project his intimate friend Sostratus, with several others among the pages; and it was agreed among

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 54. He refers to Hermippus, who mentions what was told to Aristotle by Strœbus, the reader attendant on Kallisthenes.

[2] Arrian, iv. 13; Curtius, viii. 6, 7.

them to kill Alexander in his chamber, on the first night when they were all on guard together. The appointed night arrived, without any divulgation of their secret; yet the scheme was frustrated by the accident, that Alexander continued till daybreak drinking with his officers, and never retired to bed. On the morrow, one of the conspirators, becoming alarmed or repentant, divulged the scheme to his friend Charikles, with the names of those concerned. Eurylochus, brother to Charikles, apprised by him of what he had heard, immediately informed Ptolemy, through whom it was conveyed to Alexander. By Alexander's order, the persons indicated were arrested and put to the torture[1]; under which they confessed that they had themselves conspired to kill him, but named no other accomplices, and even denied that any one else was privy to the scheme. In this denial they persisted, though extreme suffering was applied to extort the revelation of new names. They were then brought up and arraigned as conspirators before the assembled Macedonian soldiers. There their confession was repeated. It is even said that Hermolaus, in repeating it, boasted of the enterprise as legitimate and glorious; denouncing the tyranny and cruelty of Alexander as having become insupportable to a freeman. Whether such boast was actually made or not, the persons brought up were pronounced guilty, and stoned to death forthwith by the soldiers[2].

[1] Arrian, iv. 13, 13.

[2] Arrian, iv. 14, 4. Curtius expands this scene into great detail; composing a long speech for Hermolaus, and another for Alexander (viii. 6, 7, 8).

He says that the soldiers who executed these pages, tortured them first, in order to manifest zeal for Alexander (viii. 8, 20).

Kallisthenes is arrested as an accomplice—antipathy manifested by Alexander against him, and against Aristotle also.

The pages thus executed were young men of good Macedonian families, for whose condemnation accordingly, Alexander had thought it necessary to invoke—what he was sure of obtaining against any one—the sentence of the soldiers. To satisfy his hatred against Kallisthenes—not a Macedonian, but only a Greek citizen, one of the surviving remnants of the subverted city of Olynthus—no such formality was required[1]. As yet, there was not a shadow of proof to implicate this philosopher; for obnoxious as his name was known to be, Hermolaus and his companions had, with exemplary fortitude, declined to purchase the chance of respite from extreme torture by pronouncing it. Their confessions,—all extorted by suffering, unless confirmed by other evidence, of which we do not know whether any was taken—were hardly of the least value, even against themselves; but against Kallisthenes, they had no bearing whatever; nay, they tended indirectly, not to convict, but to absolve him. In his case, therefore, as in that of Philotas before, it was necessary to pick up matter of suspicious tendency from his reported remarks and conversations. He was alleged[2] to have addressed dangerous and inflammatory language to the pages, holding up Alexander to odium, instigating them to conspiracy, and pointing out Athens as a place of refuge; he was moreover well known to have been often in conversation with Hermolaus. For a man of the violent temper and omnipotent authority of Alexander, such

[1] "Quem, si Macedo esset (Callisthenem), tecum introduxissem, dignissimum te discipulo magistrum: nunc Olynthio non idem juris est" (Curtius, viii. 8, 19—speech of Alexander before the soldiers, addressing Hermolaus especially).

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 55; Arrian, iv. 10, 4.

indications were quite sufficient as grounds of action against one whom he hated.

On this occasion, we have the state of Alexander's mind disclosed by himself, in one of the references to his letters given by Plutarch. Writing to Kraterus and to others immediately afterwards, Alexander distinctly stated that the pages throughout all their torture had deposed against no one but themselves. Nevertheless, in another letter, addressed to Antipater in Macedonia, he used these expressions—"The pages were stoned to death by the Macedonians; but I myself shall punish the sophist, as well as those who sent him out here, and those who harbour in their cities conspirators against me[1]." The sophist Kallisthenes had been sent out by Aristotle, who is here designated; and probably the Athenians after him. Fortunately for Aristotle, he was not at Baktra, but at Athens. That he could have had any concern in the conspiracy of the pages, was

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 55. Καίτοι τῶν περὶ Ἑρμόλαον οὐδεὶς οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀνάγκης Καλλισθένους κατεῖπεν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος αὐτὸς εὐθὺς γράφων Κρατέρῳ καὶ Ἀττάλῳ καὶ Ἀλκέτᾳ φησὶ τοὺς παῖδας βασανιζομένους ὁμολογεῖν, ὡς αὐτοὶ ταῦτα πράξειαν, ἄλλος δὲ οὐδεὶς συνειδείη. Ὕστερον δὲ γράφων πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον, καὶ τὸν Καλλισθενην συνεπαιτιασάμενος, Οἱ μὲν παῖδές, φησιν, ὑπὸ τῶν Μακεδόνων κατελεύσθησαν, τὸν δὲ σοφιστὴν ἐγὼ κολάσω, καὶ τοὺς ἐκπέμψαντας αὐτὸν, καὶ τοὺς ὑποδεχομένους ταῖς πόλεσι τοὺς ἐμοὶ ἐπιβουλεύοντας .....ἄντικρυς ἔν γε τούτοις ἀποκαλυπτόμενος πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην, &c.

About the hostile dispositions of Alexander towards Aristotle, see Dio Chrysostom, Orat. 64. de Fortunâ, p. 598.

Kraterus was at this time absent in Sogdiana, engaged in finishing the suppression of the resistance (Arrian, iv. 22, 1). To him, therefore, Alexander would naturally write.

This statement, from the pen of Alexander himself, distinctly contradicts and refutes (as I have before observed) the affirmation of Ptolemy and Aristobulus as given by Arrian (iv. 14, 1)—that the pages deposed against Kallisthenes.

impossible. In this savage outburst of menace against his absent preceptor, Alexander discloses the real state of feeling which prompted him to the destruction of Kallisthenes; hatred towards that spirit of citizenship and free speech, which Kallisthenes not only cherished, in common with Aristotle and most other literary Greeks, but had courageously manifested in his protest against the motion for worshiping a mortal.

Kallisthenes is tortured and hanged.

Kallisthenes was first put to the torture and then hanged[1]. His tragical fate excited a profound sentiment of sympathy and indignation among the philosophers of antiquity[2].

B.C. 327, summer. Alexander reduces the country between the Hindoo-Koosh and the Indus.

The halts of Alexander were formidable to friends and companions; his marches, to the unconquered natives whom he chose to treat as enemies. On the return of Kraterus from Sogdiana, Alexander began his march from Baktra (Balkh) southward

[1] Arrian, iv. 14, 5. Curtius also says—"Callisthenes quoque tortus interiit, initi consilii in caput regis innoxius, sed haudquaquam aulæ et assentantium accommodatus ingenio (viii. 8, 21)." Compare Plutarch, Alex. 55.

This is the statement of Ptolemy; who was himself concerned in the transactions, and was the officer through whom the conspiracy of the pages had been revealed. His partiality might permit him to omit or soften what was discreditable to Alexander, but he may be fully trusted when he records an act of cruelty. Aristobulus and others affirmed that Kallisthenes was put in chains and carried about in this condition for some time; after which he died of disease and a wretched state of body. But the witnesses here are persons whose means of information we do not know to be so good as those of Ptolemy; besides that the statement is intrinsically less probable.

[2] See the language of Seneca, Nat. Quæst. vi. 23; Plutarch, De Adulator. et Amici Discrimine, p. 65; Theophrast. ap. Cicero. Tusc. Disp. iii. 10.

Curtius says that this treatment of Kallisthenes was followed by a late repentance on the part of Alexander (viii. 8, 23). On this point there is no other evidence—nor can I think the statement probable.

to the mountain range Paropamisus or Caucasus (Hindoo-Koosh); leaving however at Baktra Amyntas, with a large force of 10,000 foot and 3500 horse, to keep these intractable territories in subjugation[1]. His march over the mountains occupied ten days; he then visited his newly-founded city Alexandria in the Paropamisadæ. At or near the river Kophen (Kabool river), he was joined by Taxiles, a powerful Indian prince, who brought as a present twenty-five elephants, and whose alliance was very valuable to him. He then divided his army, sending one division under Hephæstion and Perdikkas, towards the territory called Peukelaôtis (apparently that immediately north of the confluence of the Kabool river with the Indus); and conducting the remainder himself in an easterly direction, over the mountainous regions between the Hindoo-Koosh and the right bank of the Indus. Hephæstion was ordered, after subduing all enemies in his way, to prepare a bridge ready for passing the Indus by the time when Alexander should arrive. Astes, prince of Peukelaôtis, was taken and slain in the city where he had shut himself up; but the reduction of it cost Hephæstion a siege of thirty days[2].

B.C. 327–326. Conquest of tribes on the right bank of the Indus—the Rock of Aornos.

Alexander, with his own half of the army, undertook the reduction of the Aspasii, the Guræi, and the Assakeni, tribes occupying mountainous and difficult localities along the southern slopes of the Hindoo-Koosh; but neither they nor their various towns mentioned—Arigæon, Massaga, Bazira, Ora, Dyrta, &c., except perhaps the remarkable rock

[1] Arrian, iv. 22, 4.

[2] Arrian, iv. 22, 8–12.

of Aornos[1], near the Indus—can be more exactly identified. These tribes were generally brave, and

[1] Respecting the rock called Aornos, a valuable and elaborate article, entitled "Gradus ad Aornon," has been published by Major Abbott in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. iv. 1854. This article gives much information, collected mainly by inquiries on the spot, and accompanied by a map, about the very little known country west of the Indus, between the Kabool river on the south, and the Hindoo-Koosh on the north.

Major Abbott attempts to follow the march and operations of Alexander, from Alexandria ad Caucasum to the rock of Aornos (p. 311 *seq.*). He shows highly probable reason for believing that the Aornos described by Arrian is the Mount Mahabunn, near the right bank of the Indus (lat. 34° 20′), about sixty miles above its confluence with the Kabool river. "The whole account of Arrian of the rock Aornos is a faithful picture of the Mahabunn. It was the most remarkable feature of the country. It was the refuge of all the neighbouring tribes. It was covered with forest. It had good soil sufficient for a thousand ploughs, and pure springs of water everywhere abounded. It was 4125 feet above the plain, and fourteen miles in circuit. The summit was a plain where cavalry could act. It would be difficult to offer a more faithful description of the Mahabunn. The side on which Alexander scaled the main summit had certainly the character of a rock. But the whole description of Arrian indicates a table mountain" (p. 341). The Mahabunn "is a mountain table, scarped on the east by tremendous precipices, from which descends one large spur down upon the Indus between Sitana and Umb" (p. 340).

To this similarity in so many local features, is to be added the remarkable coincidence of name, between the town Embolima, where Arrian states that Alexander established his camp for the purpose of attacking Aornos—and the modern names Umb and Balimah (between the Mahabunn and the Indus)—"the one in the river valley, the other on the mountain immediately above it" (p. 344). Mount Mahabunn is the natural refuge for the people of the neighbourhood from a conqueror, and was among the places taken by Nadir Shah (p. 338).

A strong case of identity is thus made out between this mountain and the Aornos *described by Arrian*. But undoubtedly it does not coincide with the Aornos *described by Curtius*, who compares Aornos to a Meta (the conical goal of the stadium), and says that the Indus washed its base, —that at the first assault several Macedonian soldiers were hurled down into the river. This close juxtaposition of the Indus has been the principal feature looked for by travellers who have sought for Aornos; but no place has yet been found answering the conditions required. We have here to make our election between Arrian and Curtius. Now there is a general presumption in Arrian's favour, in the description of

seconded by towns of strong position as well as by a rugged country, in many parts utterly without roads[1]. But their defence was conducted with little union, no military skill, and miserable weapons; so that they were no way qualified to oppose the excellent combination and rapid movements of Alexander, together with the confident attack and very superior arms, offensive as well as defensive, of his soldiers. All those who attempted resistance were successively attacked, overpowered, and slain. Even those who did not resist, but fled to the mountains, were pursued, and either slaughtered or sold for slaves. The only way of escaping the sword was to remain, submit, and await the fiat of the invader. Such a series of uninterrupted successes, all achieved with little loss, it is rare in military history to read. The capture of the rock of Aornos was peculiarly gratifying to Alex-

military operations, where he makes a positive statement; but in this case, the presumption is peculiarly strong, because Ptolemy was in the most conspicuous and difficult command for the capture of Aornos, and was therefore likely to be particular in the description of a scene where he had reaped much glory.

[1] Arrian, iv. 30, 13. ἡ στρατιὰ αὐτῷ ὡδοποιεῖτο πρόσω ἰοῦσῳ, ἄπορα ἄλλως ὄντα τὰ ταύτῃ χώρια, &c.

The countries here traversed by Alexander include parts of Kafiristan, Swart, Bajore, Chitral, the neighbourhood of the Kameh and other affluents of the river Kabul before it falls into the Indus near Attock. Most of this is Terra Incognita even at present; especially Kafiristan, a territory inhabited by a population said to be rude and barbarous, but which has never been conquered—nor indeed ever visited by strangers. It is remarkable, that among the inhabitants of Kafiristan,—as well as among those of Badakshan, on the other or northern side of the Hindoo-Koosh—there exist traditions respecting Alexander, together with a sort of belief that they themselves are descended from his soldiers. See Ritter's Erdkunde, part vii. book iii. p. 200 *seq.*; Burnes's Travels, vol. iii. ch. 4. p. 186, 2nd ed.; Wilson, Ariana Antiqua, p. 194 *seq.*

ander, because it enjoyed the legendary reputation of having been assailed in vain by Heraxles—and indeed he himself had deemed it, at first sight, unassailable. After having thus subdued the upper regions (above Attock or the confluence of the Kabul river) on the right bank of the Indus, he availed himself of some forests alongside to fell timber and build boats. These boats were sent down the stream, to the point where Hephæstion and Perdikkas were preparing the bridge[1].

B.C. 326, spring. Alexander crosses the Indus—forces the passage of the Hydaspes, defeating Porus—generous treatment of Porus.

Such fatiguing operations of Alexander, accomplished amidst all the hardships of winter, were followed by a halt of thirty days, to refresh the soldiers, before he crossed the Indus, in the early spring of 326 B.C.[2] It is presumed, probably enough, that he crossed at or near Attock, the passage now frequented. He first marched to Taxila, where the prince Taxilus at once submitted, and reinforced the army with a strong contingent of Indian soldiers. His alliance and information was found extremely valuable. The whole neighbouring territory submitted, and was placed under Philippus as satrap, with a garrison and depôt at Taxila. He experienced no resistance until he reached the river Hydaspes (Jelum), on the other side of which the Indian prince Porus stood prepared to dispute the passage; a brave man, with a formidable force, better armed than Indians generally were, and with many trained elephants; which

[1] Arrian, iv. 30, 16; v. 7, 2.

[2] The halt of thirty days is mentioned by Diodorus, xvii. 86. For the proof that these operations took place in winter, see the valuable citation from Aristobulus given in Strabo (xv. p. 691).

animals the Macedonians had never yet encountered in battle. By a series of admirable military combinations, Alexander eluded the vigilance of Porus, stole the passage of the river at a point a few miles above, and completely defeated the Indian army. In spite of their elephants, which were skilfully managed, the Indians could not long withstand the shock of close combat, against such cavalry and infantry as the Macedonian. Porus, a prince of gigantic stature, mounted on an elephant, fought with the utmost gallantry, rallying his broken troops and keeping them together until the last. Having seen two of his sons slain, himself wounded and perishing with thirst, he was only preserved by the special directions of Alexander. When Porus was brought before him, Alexander was struck with admiration at his stature, beauty, and undaunted bearing[1]. Addressing him first, he asked, what Porus wished to be done for him. "That you should treat me as a king," was the reply of Porus. Alexander, delighted with these words, behaved towards Porus with the utmost courtesy and generosity; not only ensuring to him his actual

[1] Arrian, v 19, 1. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὡς προσάγοντα ἐπύθετο, προσιππεύσας πρὸ τῆς τάξεως σὺν ὀλίγοις τῶν ἑταίρων ἅπαντᾷ τῷ Πώρῳ, καὶ ἐπιστήσας τὸν ἵππον, τό τε μέγεθος ἐθαύμαζεν ὑπὲρ πέντε πήχεις μάλιστα ξυμβαῖνον, καὶ τὸ κάλλος τοῦ Πώρου, καὶ ὅτι οὐ δεδουλωμένος τῇ γνώμῃ ἐφαίνετο, &c.

We see here how Alexander was struck with the stature and personal beauty of Porus, and how much these visual impressions contributed to determine, or at least to strengthen, his favourable sympathies towards the captive prince. This illustrates what I have observed in the last chapter, in recounting his treatment of the eunuch Batis after the capture of Gaza; that the repulsive appearance of Batis greatly heightened Alexander's indignation. With a man of such violent impulses as Alexander, these external impressions were of no inconsiderable moment.

kingdom, but enlarging it by new additions. He found in Porus a faithful and efficient ally. This was the greatest day of Alexander's life; if we take together the splendour and difficulty of the military achievement, and the generous treatment of his conquered opponent[1].

B.C. 326, April–May. His farther conquests in the Punjab. Sangala, the last of them.

Alexander celebrated his victory by sacrifices to the Gods, and festivities on the banks of the Hydaspes; where he also gave directions for the foundation of two cities—Nikæa, on the eastern bank; and Bukephalia, on the western, so named in commemoration of his favourite horse, who died here of age and fatigue[2]. Leaving Kraterus to lay

[1] These operations are described in Arrian, v. 9. v. 19 (we may remark, that Ptolemy and Aristobulus, though both present, differed on many points, v. 14); Curtius, viii. 13, 14; Diodor. xvii. 87, 88. According to Plutarch (Alex. 60), Alexander dwelt much upon the battle in his own letters.

There are two principal points—Jelum and Julalpoor—where high roads from the Indus now cross the Hydaspes. Each of these points have been assigned by different writers, as the probable scene of the crossing of the river by Alexander. Of the two, Jelum (rather higher up the river than Julalpoor) seems the more probable. Burns points out that near Jelum, the river is divided into five or six channels with islands (Travels, vol. ii. ch. 2. p. 50, 2nd ed.). Captain Abbott (in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, Dec. 1848) has given an interesting memoir on the features and course of the Hydaspes a little above Jelum, comparing them with the particulars stated by Arrian, and showing highly plausible reasons in support of this hypothesis—that the crossing took place near Jelum.

Diodorus mentions a halt of thirty days, after the victory (xvii. 89), which seems not probable. Both he and Curtius allude to numerous serpents, by which the army was annoyed between the Akesines and the Hydraotes (Curtius, ix. 1, 11).

[2] Arrian states (v. 19, 5) that the victory over Porus was gained in the month Munychion of the archon Hegemon at Athens—that is, about the end of April, 326 B.C. This date is not to be reconciled with another passage, v. 9, 6—where he says that the summer solstice had already passed, and that all the rivers of the Punjab were full of water, turbid and violent. This swelling of the rivers begins about June;

out and erect these new establishments, as well as to keep up communication, he conducted his army onward in an easterly direction towards the river Akesines (Chenab)[1]. His recent victory had spread terror around; the Glaukæ, a powerful Indian tribe, with thirty-seven towns and many populous villages, submitted, and were placed under the dominion of Porus; while embassies of submission were also received from two considerable princes—Abisares, and a second Porus, hitherto at enmity with his namesake. The passage of the great river Akesines, now full and impetuous in its current,

they do not attain their full height until August. Moreover, the description of the battle, as given both by Arrian and by Curtius, implies that it took place after the rainy season had begun (Arrian, v. 9, 7; v. 12, 5. Curtius, viii. 14, 4).

Some critics have proposed to read *Metageitnion* (July–August) as the month, instead of *Munychion*; an alteration approved by Mr. Clinton and received into the text by Schmieder. But if this alteration be admitted, the name of the Athenian archon must be altered also; for Metageitnion of the archon Hegemon would be eight months earlier (July–August, 327 B.C.); and at this date, Alexander had not as yet crossed the Indus, as the passage of Aristobulus (ap. Strabo. xv. p. 691) plainly shows—and as Droysen and Mützel remark. Alexander did not cross the Indus before the spring of 326 B.C. If, in place of the archon Hegemon, we substitute the next following archon Chremês (and it is remarkable that Diodorus assigns the battle to this later archonship, xvii. 87), this would be July–August 326 B.C.; which would be a more admissible date for the battle than the preceding month of Munychion. At the same time, the substitution of Metageitnion is mere conjecture; and seems to leave hardly time enough for the subsequent events. As far as an opinion can be formed, it would seem that the battle was fought about the end of June or beginning of July 326 B.C., after the rainy season had commenced; towards the close of the archonship of Hegemon, and the beginning of that of Chremes.

[1] Arrian, v. 20; Diodor. xvii. 95. Lieut. Wood (Journey to the source of the Oxus, p. 11–39) remarks that the large rivers of the Punjab change their course so often and so considerably, that monuments and indications of Alexander's march in that territory cannot be expected to remain, especially in ground near rivers.

was accomplished by boats and by inflated hides, yet not without difficulty and danger. From thence he proceeded onward in the same direction, across the Punjab—finding no enemies, but leaving detachments at suitable posts to keep up his communications and ensure his supplies—to the river Hydraotes or Ravee; which, though not less broad and full than the Akesines, was comparatively tranquil, so as to be crossed with facility[1]. Here some free Indian tribes, Kathæans and others, had the courage to resist. They first attempted to maintain themselves in Sangala by surrounding their town with a triple entrenchment of waggons. These being attacked and carried, they were driven within the walls, which they now began to despair of defending, and resolved to evacuate by night. But the project was divulged to Alexander by deserters, and frustrated by his vigilance. On the next day, he took the town by storm, putting to the sword 17,000 Indians, and taking (according to Arrian) 70,000 captives. His own loss before the town was less than 100 killed, and 1200 wounded. Two neighbouring towns, in alliance with Sangala, were evacuated by their terrified inhabitants. Alexander pursued, but could not overtake them, except 500 sick or weakly persons, whom his soldiers put to death. Demolishing the town of Sangala, he added the territory to the dominion of Porus, then present, with a contingent of 5000 Indians[2].

B.C. 326, summer. Sangala was the easternmost of all Alexander's conquests. Presently his march brought him to the river Hyphasis (Sutledge), the last of the rivers

[1] Arrian, v. 20. [2] Arrian, v. 23, 24; Curtius, ix. 1, 15.

He reaches the Hyphasis (Sutledge), the farthest of the rivers of the Punjab. His army refuses to march farther.

in the Punjab—seemingly at a point below its confluence with the Beas. Beyond this river, broad and rapid, Alexander was informed that there lay a desert of eleven days' march, extending to a still greater river called the Ganges; beyond which dwelt the Gandaridæ, the most powerful, warlike, and populous, of all the Indian tribes, distinguished for the number and training of their elephants[1]. The prospect of a difficult march, and of an enemy esteemed invincible, only instigated his ardour. He gave orders for the crossing. But here for the first time his army, officers as well as soldiers, manifested symptoms of uncontrolable weariness; murmuring aloud at these endless toils, and marches they knew not whither. They had already overpassed the limits where Dionysus and Herakles were said to have stopped: they were travelling into regions hitherto unvisited either by Greeks or by Persians, merely for the purpose of provoking and conquering new enemies. Of victories they were sated; of their plunder, abundant as it was, they had no enjoyment[2]; the hardships of a perpetual onward march, often excessively accelerated, had exhausted both men and horses; moreover, their advance from the Hydaspes had been accomplished in the wet season, under rains more violent and continued than they had ever before experienced[3].

[1] Curtius, ix. 2, 3; Diodor. xvii. 93; Plutarch, Alex. 62.

[2] Curtius, ix. 3, 11 (speech of Kœnus). "Quoto cuique lorica est? Quis equum habet? Jube quæri, quam multos servi ipsorum persecuti sint, quid cuique supersit ex prædâ. Omnium victores, omnium inopes sumus."

[3] Aristobulus ap. Strabo. xv. p. 691-697. *ὕεσθαι συνεχῶς.* Arrian, v. 29, 8; Diodor. xvii. 93. *χειμῶνες ἄγριοι κατεῤῥάγησαν ἐφ' ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα, καὶ βρονταὶ συνεχεῖς καὶ κεραυνοὶ κατέσκηπτον,* &c.

Informed of the reigning discontent, Alexander assembled his officers and harangued them, endeavouring to revive in them that forward spirit and promptitude which he had hitherto found not inadequate to his own[1]. But he entirely failed. No one indeed dared openly to contradict him. Kœnus alone hazarded some words of timid dissuasion; the rest manifested a passive and sullen repugnance, even when he proclaimed that those who desired might return, with the shame of having deserted their king, while he would march forward with the volunteers only. After a suspense of two days, passed in solitary and silent mortification—he still apparently persisted in his determination, and offered the sacrifice usual previous to the passage of a river. The victims were inauspicious; he bowed to the will of the Gods; and gave orders for return, to the unanimous and unbounded delight of his army[2].

[1] In the speech which Arrian (v. 25, 26) puts into the mouth of Alexander, the most curious point is, the geographical views which he promulgates. "We have not much farther now to march (he was standing on the western bank of the Sutledge) to the river Ganges, and the great Eastern Sea which surrounds the whole earth. The Hyrkanian (Caspian) Sea joins on to this great sea on one side, the Persian Gulf on the other; after we have subdued all those nations which lie before us eastward towards the Great Sea, and northward towards the Hyrkanian Sea, we shall then sail by water first to the Persian Gulf, next round Libya to the pillars of Herakles; from thence we shall march back all through Libya, and add it to all Asia as parts of our empire." (I here abridge rather than translate.)

It is remarkable, that while Alexander made so prodigious an error in narrowing the eastern limits of Asia, the Ptolemaic geography, recognised in the time of Columbus, made an error not less in the opposite direction, stretching it too far to the East. It was upon the faith of this last mistake, that Columbus projected his voyage of circumnavigation from Western Europe, expecting to come to the eastern coast of Asia from the West, after no great length of voyage.

[2] Arrian, v. 28, 7. The fact that Alexander, under all this insuperable repugnance of his soldiers, still offered the sacrifice preliminary to

Alexander returns to the Hydaspes.

To mark the last extremity of his eastward progress, he erected twelve altars of extraordinary height and dimension on the western bank of the Hyphasis, offering sacrifices of thanks to the Gods, with the usual festivities, and matches of agility and force. Then, having committed all the territory west of the Hyphasis to the government of Porus, he marched back, repassed the Hydraotes and Akesines, and returned to the Hydaspes near the point where he had first crossed it. The two new cities—Bukephalia and Nikæa—which he had left orders for commencing on that river, had suffered much from the rains and inundations during his forward march to the Hyphasis, and now required the aid of the army to repair the damage[1]. The heavy rains continued throughout most of his return march to the Hydaspes[2].

B.C. 326, autumn.

He constructs a fleet, and sails down the Hydaspes and the Indus.

Dangerous wound of Alexander in attacking the Malli.

On coming back to this river, Alexander received a large reinforcement both of cavalry and infantry, sent to him from Europe, together with 25,000 new panoplies, and a considerable stock of medicines[3]. Had these reinforcements reached him on the Hyphasis, it seems not impossible that he might have prevailed on his army to accompany him in his farther advance to the Ganges and the regions beyond. He now employed himself, assisted by Porus and Taxilus, in collecting and constructing a fleet for sailing down the Hydaspes and thence

crossing—is curious as an illustration of his character, and was specially attested by Ptolemy.

[1] Arrian, v. 29, 8; Diodor. xvii. 95.

[2] Aristobulus ap. Strab. xv. p. 691—until the rising of Arkturus. Diodorus says, 70 days (xvii. 93), which seems more probable.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 95; Curtius, ix. 3, 21.

down to the mouth of the Indus. By the early part of November, a fleet of nearly 2000 boats or vessels of various sizes having been prepared, he began his voyage[1]. Kraterus marched with one division of the army, along the right bank of the Hydaspes—Hephæstion on the left bank with the remainder, including 200 elephants; Nearchus had the command of the fleet in the river, on board of which was Alexander himself. He pursued his voyage slowly down the river, to the confluence of the Hydaspes with the Akesines—with the Hydraotes—and with the Hyphasis—all pouring, in one united stream, into the Indus. He sailed down the Indus to its junction with the Indian Ocean. Altogether this voyage occupied nine months[2], from November 326 B.C. to August 325 B.C. But it was a voyage full of active military operations on both sides of the river. Alexander perpetually disembarked, to attack, subdue, and slaughter all such nations near the banks as did not voluntarily submit. Among them were the Malli and Oxydrakæ, free and brave tribes, who resolved to defend their liberty, but, unfortunately for themselves, were

[1] The voyage was commenced a few days before the setting of the Pleiades (Aristobulus ap. Strab. xv. p. 692).

For the number of the ships, see Ptolemy ap. Arrian. vi. 2, 8.

On seeing crocodiles in the Indus, Alexander was at first led to suppose that it was the same river as the Nile, and that he had discovered the higher course of the Nile, from whence it flowed into Egypt. This is curious, as an illustration of the geographical knowledge of the time (Arrian, vi. 1, 3).

[2] Aristobulus ap. Strab. xv. p. 692. Aristobulus said that the downward voyage occupied ten months; this seems longer than the exact reality. Moreover Aristobulus said that they had no rain during all the voyage down, through all the summer months: Nearchus stated the contrary (Strabo, *l. c.*).

habitually at variance, and could not now accomplish any hearty cooperation against the common invader[1]. Alexander first assailed the Malli with his usual celerity and vigour, beat them with slaughter in the field, and took several of their towns[2]. There remained only their last and strongest town, from which the defenders were already driven out and forced to retire to the citadel[3]. Thither they were pursued by the Macedonians, Alexander himself being among the foremost, with only a few guards near him. Impatient because the troops with their scaling-ladders did not come up more rapidly, he mounted upon a ladder that happened to be at hand, attended only by Peukestes and one or two others, with an adventurous courage even transcending what he was wont to display. Having cleared the wall by killing several of its defenders, he jumped down into the interior of the citadel, and made head for some time, nearly alone, against all within. He received however a bad wound from an arrow in the breast, and was on the point of fainting, when his soldiers burst in, rescued him, and took the place. Every person within, man, woman, and child, was slain[4].

The wound of Alexander was so severe, that he B.C. 325.

[1] Curtius, ix. 4, 15; Diodor. xvii. 98.

[2] Arrian, vi. 7, 8.

[3] This last stronghold of the Malli is supposed, by Mr. Cunningham and others, to have been the modern city of Multan. The river Ravee or Hydraotes is said to have formerly run past the city of Multan into the Chenab or Akesines.

[4] Arrian, vi. 9, 10, 11. He notices the great discrepancy in the various accounts given of this achievement and dangerous wound of Alexander. Compare Diodor. xvii. 98, 99; Curtius, ix. 4, 5; Plutarch, Alex. 63.

New cities and posts to be established on the Indus —Alexander reaches the ocean— effect of the first sight of tides.

was at first reported to be dead, to the great consternation and distress of the army. However, he became soon sufficiently recovered to show himself, and to receive their ardent congratulations, in the camp established at the point of junction between the Hydraotes (Ravee) and (Akesines) Chenab[1]. His voyage down the river, though delayed by the care of his wound, was soon resumed and prosecuted, with the same active operations by his land-force on both sides to subjugate all the Indian tribes and cities within accessible distance. At the junction of the river Akesines (Punjnud) with the Indus, Alexander directed the foundation of a new city, with adequate docks and conveniences for ship-building, whereby he expected to command the internal navigation[2]. Having no farther occasion now for so large a land-force, he sent a large portion of it under Kraterus westward (seemingly through the pass now called Bolan) into Karmania[3]. He established another military and naval post at Pattala, where the Delta of the Indus divided; and he then sailed with a portion of his fleet down the right arm of the river to have the first sight of the Indian Ocean. The view of ebbing and flowing tide, of which none had had experience on the scale there exhibited, occasioned to all much astonishment and alarm[4].

[1] Arrian, xi. 13.

[2] Arrian, xi. 15, 5.

[3] Arrian, xi. 17, 6; Strabo, xv. p. 721.

[4] Arrian, xi. 18, 19; Curtius, ix. 9. He reached Pattala towards the middle or end of July, περὶ κυνὸς ἐπιτολήν (Strabo, xv. p 692).

The site of Pattala has been usually looked for near the modern Tatta. But Dr. Kennedy, in his recent 'Narrative of the Campaign of the Army of the Indus in Scinde and Kabool' (ch v. p. 104), shows some reasons for thinking that it must have been considerably higher

B.C. 325. March of Alexander by land westward through the desert of Gedrosia—sufferings and losses in the army.

The fleet was now left to be conducted by the admiral Nearchus, from the mouth of the Indus round by the Persian Gulf to that of the Tigris; a memorable nautical enterprise in Grecian antiquity. Alexander himself (about the month of August) began his march by land westward through the territories of the Arabitæ and the Oritæ, and afterwards through the deserts of Gedrosia. Pura, the principal town of the Gedrosians, was sixty days' march from the boundary of the Oritæ[1].

Here his army, though without any formidable opposing enemy, underwent the most severe and deplorable sufferings; their march being through a sandy and trackless desert, with short supplies of food and still shorter supplies of water, under a burning sun. The loss in men, horses, and baggage-cattle, from thirst, fatigue, and disease, was prodigious; and it required all the unconquerable energy of Alexander to bring through even the diminished number[2]. At Pura the army obtained repose and refreshment, and was enabled to march forward into Karmania, where Kraterus joined them with his division from the Indus, and Kleander with the division which had been left at Ekbatana. Kleander, accused of heinous crimes in his late

up the river than Tatta; somewhere near Schwan. "The Delta commencing about 130 miles above the sea, its northern apex would be somewhere midway between Hyderabad and Schwan; where local traditions still speak of ancient cities destroyed, and of greater changes having occurred than in any other part of the course of the Indus."

The constant changes in the course of the Indus, however (compare p. 73 of his work), noticed by all observers, render every attempt at such identification conjectural—see Wood's Journey to the Oxus, p. 12.

[1] Arrian, vi. 24, 2; Strabo, xv. p. 723.

[2] Arrian, vi. 25, 26; Curtius, ix. 10; Plutarch, Alex. 66.

command, was put to death or imprisoned; several of his comrades were executed. To recompense the soldiers for their recent distress in Gedrosia, the king conducted them for seven days in drunken bacchanalian procession through Karmania, himself and all his friends taking part in the revelry; an imitation of the jovial festivity and triumph with which the god Dionysus had marched back from the conquest of India[1].

B.C. 325–324, winter. Alexander and the army come back to Persis. Conduct of Alexander at Persepolis. Punishment of the satrap Orsines.

During the halt in Karmania Alexander had the satisfaction of seeing his admiral Nearchus[2], who had brought the fleet round from the mouth of the Indus to the harbour called Harmozeia (Ormuz), not far from the entrance of the Persian Gulf; a voyage of much hardship and distress, along the barren coasts of the Oritæ, the Gedrosians, and the Ichthyophagi[3]. Nearchus, highly commended

[1] Curtius, ix. 10; Diodor. xvii. 106; Plutarch, Alex. 67. Arrian (vi. 28) found this festal progress mentioned in some authorities, but not in others. Neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus mentioned it. Accordingly Arrian refuses to believe it. There may have been exaggerations or falsities as to the details of the march; but as a general fact, I see no sufficient ground for disbelieving it. A season of excessive licence to the soldiers, after their extreme suffering in Gedrosia, was by no means unnatural to grant. Moreover, it corresponds to the general conception of the returning march of Dionysus in antiquity, while the imitation of that god was quite in conformity with Alexander's turn of sentiment.

I have already remarked, that the silence of Ptolemy and Aristobulus is too strongly insisted on, both by Arrian and by others, as a reason for disbelieving affirmations respecting Alexander.

Arrian and Curtius (x. 1) differ in their statements about the treatment of Kleander. According to Arrian, he was put to death; according to Curtius, he was spared from death, and simply put in prison, in consequence of the important service which he had rendered by killing Parmenio with his own hand; while 600 of his accomplices and agents were put to death.

[2] Nearchus had begun his voyage about the end of September, or beginning of October (Arrian, Indic. 21; Strabo, xv p. 721).

[3] Arrian, vi. 28, 7; Arrian, Indica, c. 33–37.

and honoured, was presently sent back to complete his voyage as far as the mouth of the Euphrates; while Hephæstion also was directed to conduct the larger portion of the army, with the elephants and heavy baggage, by the road near the coast from Karmania into Persis. This road, though circuitous, was the most convenient, as it was now the winter season[1]; but Alexander himself, with the lighter divisions of his army, took the more direct mountain road from Karmania to Pasargadæ and Persepolis. Visiting the tomb of Cyrus the Great, founder of the Persian empire, he was incensed to find it violated and pillaged. He caused it to be carefully restored, put to death a Macedonian named Polymachus as the offender, and tortured the Magian guardians of it for the purpose of discovering accomplices, but in vain[2]. Orsines, satrap of Persis, was however accused of connivance in the deed, as well as of various acts of murder and spoliation: according to Curtius, he was not only innocent, but had manifested both good faith and devotion to Alexander[3]; in spite of which he became a victim of the hostility of the favourite eunuch Bagoas, who both poisoned the king's mind

[1] Arrian, vi. 28, 12-29, 1.

[2] Plutarch, Alex. 69; Arrian, vi. 29, 17; Strabo, xv. p. 730.

[3] Arrian, vi. 30, 2; Curtius, x. 1, 23-38. "Hic fuit exitus nobilissimi Persarum, nec insontis modo, sed eximiæ quoque benignitatis in regem." The great favour which the beautiful eunuch Bagoas (though Arrian does not mention him) enjoyed with Alexander, and the exalted position which he occupied, are attested by good contemporary evidence, especially the philosopher Dikæarchus—see Athenæ. xiii. p. 603; Dikæarch. Fragm. 19. ap. Hist. Græc. Fragm. Didot, vol. ii. p. 241. Compare the Fragments of Eumenes and Diodotus (Ælian, V. H. iii. 23) in Didot, Fragm. Scriptor. Hist. Alex. Magni, p. 121; Plutarch De Adul. et Amic. Discrim. p. 65.

with calumnies of his own, and suborned other accusers with false testimony. Whatever may be the truth of the story, Alexander caused Orsines to be hanged; naming as satrap Peukestes, whose favour was now high, partly as comrade and preserver of the king in his imminent danger at the citadel of the Malli,—partly from his having adopted the Persian dress, manners, and language, more completely than any other Macedonian [1].

B.C. 324, early spring.

He marches to Susa—junction with the fleet under Nearchus, after it had sailed round from the mouth of the Indus.

It was about February, in 324 B.C.[2], that Alexander marched out of Persis to Susa. During this progress, at the point where he crossed the Pasitigris, he was again joined by Nearchus, who having completed his circumnavigation from the mouth of the Indus to that of the Euphrates, had sailed back with the fleet from the latter river and come up the Pasitigris[3]. It is probable that the division of He-

[1] Arrian, vi. 30; Curtius, x. 1, 22-30.

[2] Mr. Fynes Clinton (Fast. Hellen. B.C. 325, also Append. p. 232) places the arrival of Alexander in Susiana, on his return march, in the month of February B.C. 325; a year too early, in my opinion. I have before remarked on the views of Mr. Clinton respecting the date of Alexander's victory over Porus on the Hydaspes, where he alters the name of the month as it stands in the text of Arrian (following Schmieder's conjecture), and supposes that battle to have occurred in August B.C. 327 instead of April B.C. 326. Mr. Clinton antedates by one year all the proceedings of Alexander subsequent to his quitting Baktria for the last time in the summer of B.C. 327. Dr. Vincent's remark—"that the supposition of *two winters* occurring after Alexander's return to Susa is not borne out by the historians" (see Clinton, p. 232), is a perfectly just one; and Mitford has not replied to it in a satisfactory manner. In my judgement, there was only an interval of sixteen months (not an interval of twenty-eight months, as Mr. Clinton supposes) between the return of Alexander to Susa and his death at Babylon (Feb. 324 B.C. to June 323 B.C.).

[3] Arrian, vii. 5, 9; Arrian, Indica, c. 42. The voluntary death of Kalanus the Indian Gymnosophist must have taken place at Susa (where Diodorus places it—xvii. 107), and not in Persis; for Nearchus was

phœstion also rejoined him at Susa, and that the whole army was there for the first time brought together, after the separation in Karmania.

B.C. 324, spring and summer.

Alexander at Susa as Great King. Subjects of uneasiness to him—the satraps—the Macedonian soldiers.

In Susa and Susiana Alexander spent some months. For the first time since his accession to the throne, he had now no military operations in hand or in immediate prospect. No enemy was before him, until it pleased him to go in quest of a new one;—nor indeed could any new one be found, except at a prodigious distance. He had emerged from the perils of the untrodden East, and had returned into the ordinary localities and conditions of Persian rule, occupying that capital city from whence the great Achæmenid kings had been accustomed to govern the Western as well as the Eastern portions of their vast empire. To their post, and to their irritable love of servility, Alexander had succeeded; but bringing with him a restless energy such as none of them except the first founder Cyrus had manifested—and a splendid military genius, such as was unknown alike to Cyrus and to his successors.

Past conduct of the satraps—several of them are punished by Alexander—alarm among them all—flight of Harpalus.

In the new position of Alexander, his principal subjects of uneasiness were, the satraps and the Macedonian soldiers. During the long interval (more than five years) which had elapsed since he marched eastward from Hyrkania in pursuit of Bessus, the satraps had necessarily been left much to themselves. Some had imagined that he would never return; an anticipation noway unreasonable, since his own impulse towards forward march was

seemingly present at the memorable scene of the funeral pile (Arrian, vii. 3, 9)—and he was not with Alexander in Persis.

so insatiate that he was only constrained to return by the resolute opposition of his own soldiers; moreover his dangerous wound among the Malli, and his calamitous march through Gedrôsia, had given rise to reports of his death, credited for some time even by Olympias and Kleopatra in Macedonia[1]. Under these uncertainties, some satraps stood accused of having pillaged rich temples, and committed acts of violence towards individuals. Apart from all criminality, real or alleged, several of them, also, had taken into pay bodies of mercenary troops, partly as a necessary means of authority in their respective districts, partly as a protection to themselves in the event of Alexander's decease. Respecting the conduct of the satraps and their officers, many denunciations and complaints were sent in; to which Alexander listened readily and even eagerly, punishing the accused with indiscriminate rigour, and resenting especially the suspicion that they had calculated upon his death[2]. Among those executed, were Abulites, satrap of Susiana, with his son Oxathres; the latter was even slain by the hands of Alexander himself with a sarissa[3]—the dispensation of punishment becoming in his hands an outburst of exasperated temper. He also despatched peremptory orders to all the satraps, enjoining them to dismiss their mercenary troops without delay[4]. This measure produced considerable effect on the condition of

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 68.

[2] Arrian, vii. 4, 2-5; Diodor. xvii. 108; Curtius, x. 1, 7. "Cœperat esse præceps ad repræsentanda supplicia, item ad deteriora credenda" (Curtius, x. 1, 39).

[3] Plutarch, Alex. 68.

[4] Diodor. xvii. 106-111.

Greece—about which I shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Harpalus, satrap of Babylon (about whom also more, presently), having squandered large sums out of the revenues of the post upon ostentatious luxury, became terrified when Alexander was approaching Susiana, and fled to Greece with a large treasure and a small body of soldiers [1]. Serious alarm was felt among all the satraps and officers, innocent as well as guilty. That the most guilty were not those who fared worst, we may see by the case of Kleomenes in Egypt, who remained unmo-

[1] Among the accusations which reached Alexander against this satrap, we are surprised to find a letter addressed to him (*ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπιστολῇ*) by the Greek historian Theopompus; who set forth with indignation the extravagant gifts and honours heaped by Harpalus upon his two successive mistresses—Pythionikê and Glykera; celebrated Hetæræ from Athens. These proceedings Theopompus describes as insults to Alexander (Theopompus ap. Athenæ. xiii. p. 586–595; Fragment. 277, 278 ed. Didot.).

The satyric drama called *Ἀγήν*, represented before Alexander at a period subsequent to the flight of Harpalus, cannot have been represented (as Athenæus states it to have been) on the banks of *the Hydaspes*, because Harpalus did not make his escape until he was frightened by the approach of Alexander *returning* from India. At the Hydaspes, Alexander was still on his outward progress; very far off, and without any idea of returning. It appears to me that the words of Athenæus respecting this drama—*ἐδίδαξε Διονυσίων ὄντων ἐπὶ τοῦ Ὑδάσπου τοῦ ποταμοῦ* (xiii. p. 595)—involve a mistake or misreading; and that it ought to stand *ἐπὶ τοῦ Χοάσπου τοῦ ποταμοῦ*. I may remark that the words *Medus Hydaspes* in Virgil, Georg. iv. 211, probably involve the same confusion. The Choaspes was the river near Susa; and this drama was performed before Alexander at Susa during the Dionysia of the year 324 B.C., after Harpalus had fled. The Dionysia were in the month Elaphebolion; now Alexander did not fight Porus on the Hydaspes until the succeeding month Munychion at the earliest—and probably later. And even if we suppose (which is not probable) that he reached the Hydaspes in Elaphebolion, he would have no leisure to celebrate dramas and a Dionysiac festival, while the army of Porus was waiting for him on the opposite bank. Moreover it is no way probable that, on the remote Hydaspes, he had any actors or chorus, or means of celebrating dramas at all.

lested in his government, though his iniquities were no secret[1].

Discontents of the Macedonian soldiers with the Asiatising intermarriages promoted by Alexander.

Among the Macedonian soldiers, discontent had been perpetually growing, from the numerous proofs which they witnessed that Alexander had made his election for an Asiatic character, and abnegated his own country. Besides his habitual adoption of the Persian costume and ceremonial, he now celebrated a sort of national Asiatic marriage at Susa. He had already married the captive Roxana, in Baktria; he next took two additional wives—Statira, daughter of Darius—and Parysatis, daughter of the preceding king Ochus. He at the same time caused eighty of his principal friends and officers, some very reluctantly, to marry (according to Persian rites) wives selected from the noblest Persian families, providing dowries for all of them[2]. He made presents besides, to all those Macedonians who gave in their names as having married Persian women. Splendid festivities[3] accompanied these nuptials, with honorary rewards distributed to favourites and meritorious officers. Macedonians and Persians, the two imperial races, one in Europe, the other in Asia, were thus intended to be amalgamated. To soften the aversion of the soldiers generally towards these Asiatising marriages[4], Alex-

[1] Arrian, vii. 18, 2; vii. 23, 9-13.

[2] Arrian, vii. 4, 6-9. By these two marriages, Alexander thus engrafted himself upon the two lines of antecedent Persian Kings. Ochus was of the Achæmenid family, but Darius Codomannus, father of Statira, was not of that family; he began a new lineage. About the overweening regal state of Alexander, outdoing even the previous Persian kings, see Phylarchus ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 539.

[3] Chares ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 538.

[4] Arrian, vii. 6, 3. καὶ τοὺς γάμους ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῷ Περσικῷ ποιη-

ander issued proclamation that he would himself discharge their debts, inviting all who owed money to give in their names with an intimation of the sums due. It was known that the debtors were numerous; yet few came to enter their names. The soldiers suspected the proclamation as a stratagem, intended for the purpose of detecting such as were spendthrifts, and obtaining a pretext for punishment: a remarkable evidence how little confidence or affection Alexander now inspired, and how completely the sentiment entertained towards him was that of fear mingled with admiration. He himself was much hurt at their mistrust, and openly complained of it; at the same time proclaiming that paymasters and tables should be planted openly in the camp, and that any soldier might come and ask for money enough to pay his debts, without being bound to give in his name. Assured of secrecy, they now made application in such numbers that the total distributed was prodigiously great; reaching, according to some, to 10,000 talents—according to Arrian, not less than 20,000 talents or £4,600,000 sterling[1].

Large as this donative was, it probably gave but partial satisfaction, since the most steady and well-conducted soldiers could have received no benefit, except in so far as they might choose to come forward with fictitious debts. A new mortification moreover was in store for the soldiers generally. There arrived

B.C. 323, spring. Their discontent with the new Asiatic soldiers levied and disciplined by Alexander.

θέντας οὐ πρὸς θυμοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν γημάντων ἐστὶν οἷς, &c.

[1] Arrian, vii. 5; Plutarch, Alex. 70; Curtius, x. 2, 9; Diodor. xvii. 109.

from the various satrapies—even from those most distant, Sogdiana, Baktria, Aria, Drangiana, Arachosia, &c.—contingents of young and fresh native troops, amounting in total to 30,000 men; all armed and drilled in the Macedonian manner. From the time when the Macedonians had refused to cross the river Hyphasis and march forward into India, Alexander saw, that for his large aggressive schemes it was necessary to disband the old soldiers, and to organise an army at once more fresh and more submissive. He accordingly despatched orders to the satraps to raise and discipline new Asiatic levies, of vigorous native youths; and the fruit of these orders was now seen[1]. Alexander reviewed the new levies, whom he called the Epigoni, with great satisfaction. He moreover incorporated many native Persians, both officers and soldiers, into the Companion-cavalry, the most honourable service in the army; making the important change of arming them with the short Macedonian thrusting-pike in place of the missile Persian javelin. They were found such apt soldiers, and the genius of Alexander for military organisation was so consummate, that he saw himself soon released from his dependence on the Macedonian veterans; a change evident enough to them as well as to him[2].

Interest of Alexander in the fleet, which sails up the Tigris to Opis.

The novelty and success of Nearchus in his exploring voyage had excited in Alexander an eager appetite for naval operations. Going on board his fleet in the Pasitigris (the Karun, the river on the

[1] Diodor. xvii. 108. It must have taken some time to get together and discipline these young troops; Alexander must therefore have sent the orders from India

[2] Arrian, vii. 6.

east side of Susa), he sailed in person down to the Persian Gulf, surveyed the coast as far as the mouth of the Tigris, and then sailed up the latter river as far as Opis. Hephæstion meanwhile, commanding the army, marched by land in concert with this voyage, and came back to Opis, where Alexander disembarked[1].

Notice of partial discharge to the Macedonian soldiers—they mutiny—wrath of Alexander—he disbands them all.

Sufficient experiment had now been made with the Asiatic levies, to enable Alexander to dispense with many of his Macedonian veterans. Calling together the army, he intimated his intention of sending home those who were unfit for service either from age or wounds, but of allotting to them presents at departure sufficient to place them in an enviable condition, and attract fresh Macedonian substitutes. On hearing this intimation, all the long-standing discontent of the soldiers at once broke out. They felt themselves set aside as worn out and useless,—and set aside, not to make room for younger men of their own country, but in favour of those Asiatics into whose arms their king had now passed. They demanded with a loud voice that he should dismiss them all—advising him by way of taunt to make his future conquests along with his father Ammon. These manifestations so incensed Alexander, that he leaped down from the elevated platform on which he had stood to speak, rushed with a few of his guards among the crowd of soldiers, and seized or caused to be seized thirteen of those apparently most forward, ordering them immediately to be put to death. The multitude were thoroughly overawed and reduced to silence,

[1] Arrian, vii. 7.

upon which Alexander remounted the platform and addressed them in a speech of considerable length. He boasted of the great exploits of Philip, and of his own still greater: he affirmed that all the benefit of his conquests had gone to the Macedonians, and that he himself had derived from them nothing but a double share of the common labours, hardships, wounds, and perils. Reproaching them as base deserters from a king who had gained for them all these unparalleled acquisitions, he concluded by giving discharge to all—commanding them forthwith to depart[1].

Remorse and humiliation of the soldiers—Alexander is appeased—reconciliation.

After this speech—teeming (as we read it in Arrian) with that exorbitant self-exaltation which formed the leading feature in his character—Alexander hurried away into the palace, where he remained shut up for two days without admitting any one except his immediate attendants. His guards departed along with him, leaving the discontented soldiers stupefied and motionless. Receiving no farther orders, nor any of the accustomed military indications[2], they were left in the helpless condition

[1] Arrian, vii. 9, 10; Plutarch, Alex. 71; Curtius, x. 2; Justin, xii. 11.

[2] See the description given by Tacitus (Hist. ii. 29) of the bringing round of the Vitellian army,—which had mutinied against the general Fabius Valens:—"Tum Alphenus Varus, præfectus castrorum, deflagrante paulatim seditione, addit consilium—vetitis obire vigilias centurionibus, omisso tubæ sono, quo miles ad belli munia cietur. Igitur torpere cuncti, circumspectare inter se attoniti, *et id ipsum, quod nemo regeret, parentes*; silentio, patientiâ, postremo precibus et lacrymis veniam quærebant. Ut vero deformis et flens, et præter spem incolumis, Valens processit, gaudium, miseratio, favor; versi in lætitiam (ut est vulgus utroque immodicum) laudantes gratantesque, circumdatum aquilis signisque, in tribunal ferunt."

Compare also the narrative in Xenophon (Anab. i. 3) of the embarrassment of the Ten Thousand Greeks at Tarsus, when they at first refused to obey Klearchus and march against the Great King.

of soldiers constrained to resolve for themselves, and at the same time altogether dependent upon Alexander whom they had offended. On the third day, they learnt that he had convened the Persian officers, and had invested them with the chief military commands, distributing the newly arrived Epigoni into divisions of infantry and cavalry, all with Macedonian military titles, and passing over the Macedonians themselves as if they did not exist. At this news, the soldiers were overwhelmed with shame and remorse. They rushed to the gates of the palace, threw down their arms, and supplicated with tears and groans for Alexander's pardon. Presently he came out, and was himself moved to tears by seeing their prostrate deportment. After testifying his full reconciliation, he caused a solemn sacrifice to be celebrated, coupled with a multitudinous banquet of mixed Macedonians and Persians. The Grecian prophets, the Persian magi, and all the guests present, united in prayer and libation for fusion, harmony, and community of empire, between the two nations[1].

Partial disbanding—body of veterans placed under command of Kraterus to return.

This complete victory over his own soldiers was probably as gratifying to Alexander as any one gained during his past life; carrying as it did a consoling retribution for the memorable stoppage on the banks of the Hyphasis, which he had neither forgotten nor forgiven. He selected 10,000 of the oldest and most exhausted among the soldiers to be sent home under Kraterus, giving to each full pay until the time of arrival in Macedonia, with a donation of one talent besides. He intended that Kra-

[1] Arrian, vii. 11.

terus, who was in bad health, should remain in Europe as viceroy of Macedonia, and that Antipater should come out to Asia with a reinforcement of troops[1]. Pursuant to this resolution, the 10,000 soldiers were now singled out for return, and separated from the main army. Yet it does not appear that they actually did return, during the ten months of Alexander's remaining life.

B.C. 324, summer. New projects of conquests contemplated by Alexander —measures for enlarging his fleet.

Of the important edict issued this summer by Alexander to the Grecian cities, and read at the Olympic festival in July—directing each city to recall its exiled citizens—I shall speak in a future chapter. He had now accomplished his object of organising a land force half Macedonian, half Asiatic. But since the expedition of Nearchus, he had become bent upon a large extension of his naval force also; which was indeed an indispensable condition towards his immediate projects of conquering Arabia, and of pushing both nautical exploration and aggrandisement from the Persian Gulf round the Arabian coast. He despatched orders to the Phenician ports, directing that a numerous fleet should be built; and that the ships should then be taken to pieces, and conveyed across to Thapsakus on the Euphrates, from whence they would sail down to Babylon. At that place, he directed the construction of other ships from the numerous cypress trees around—as well as the formation of an enormous harbour in the river at

[1] Arrian, vii. 12, 1-7; Justin, xii. 12. Kraterus was especially popular with the Macedonian soldiers, because he had always opposed, as much as he dared, the Oriental transformation of Alexander (Plutarch, Eumenes, 6).

Babylon, adequate to the accommodation of 1000 ships of war. Mikkalus, a Greek of Klazomenæ, was sent to Phenicia with 500 talents, to enlist, or to purchase, seamen for the crews. It was calculated that these preparations (probably under the superintendence of Nearchus) would be completed by the spring, for which period contingents were summoned to Babylon for the expedition against Arabia[1].

B.C. 324. Visit to Ekbatana —death of Hephæstion—violent sorrow of Alexander.

In the mean time, Alexander himself paid a visit to Ekbatana, the ordinary summer residence of the Persian kings. He conducted his army by leisurely marches, reviewing by the way the ancient regal parks of the celebrated breed called Nisæan horses —now greatly reduced in number[2]. On the march, a violent altercation occurred between his personal favourite Hephæstion,—and his secretary Eumenes, the most able, dexterous, and long-sighted man in his service. Eumenes, as a Greek of Kardia, had been always regarded with slight and jealousy by the Macedonian officers, especially by Hephæstion: Alexander now took pains to reconcile the two, experiencing no difficulty with Eumenes, but much

[1] Arrian, vii. 19. He also sent an officer named Herakleides to the shores of the Caspian sea, with orders to construct ships and make a survey of that sea (vii. 16).

[2] Arrian, vii. 13, 2; Diodor. xvii. 110. How leisurely the march was, may be seen in Diodorus.

The direction of Alexander's march from Susa to Ekbatana, along a frequented and good road which Diodorus in another place calls a royal road (xix. 19), is traced by Ritter, deriving his information chiefly from the recent researches of Major Rawlinson. The larger portion of the way lay along the western side of the chain of Mount Zagros, and on the right bank of the river Kerkha (Ritter, Erdkunde, part ix. b. 3. p. 329, West-Asia).

with Hephæstion[1]. During his stay at Ekbatana, he celebrated magnificent sacrifices and festivities, with gymnastic and musical exhibitions, which were farther enlivened, according to the Macedonian habits, by banquets and excessive wine-drinking. Amidst these proceedings, Hephæstion was seized with a fever. The vigour of his constitution emboldened him to neglect all care or regimen, so that in a few days the disease carried him off. The final crisis came on suddenly, and Alexander was warned of it while sitting in the theatre; but though he instantly hurried to the bedside, he found Hephæstion already dead. His sorrow for this loss was unbounded, manifesting itself in excesses suitable to the general violence of his impulses, whether of affection or of antipathy. Like Achilles mourning for Patroklus, he cast himself on the ground near the dead body, and remained there wailing for several hours; he refused all care, and even food, for two days; he cut his hair close, and commanded that all the horses and mules in the camp should have their manes cut close also; he not only suspended the festivities, but interdicted all music and every sign of joy in the camp; he directed that the battlements of the walls belonging to the neighbouring cities should be struck off; he hung, or crucified, the physician Glaukias, who had prescribed for Hephæstion; he ordered that a vast funeral pile should be erected at Babylon, at a cost given to us as 10,000 talents (£2,300,000), to celebrate the obsequies; he sent messengers to the

[1] Arrian, vii. 13, 1; Plutarch, Eumenes, 2.

oracle of Ammon, to enquire whether it was permitted to worship Hephæstion as a god. Many of those around him, accommodating themselves to this passionate impulse of the ruler, began at once to show a sort of worship towards the deceased, by devoting to him themselves and their arms; of which Eumenes set the example, conscious of his own personal danger, if Alexander should suspect him of being pleased at the death of his recent rival. Perdikkas was instructed to convey the body in solemn procession to Babylon, there to be burnt in state when preparations should be completed[1].

B.C. 324–323, winter. Alexander exterminates the Kossæi.

Alexander stayed at Ekbatana until winter was at hand, seeking distraction from his grief in exaggerated splendour of festivals and ostentation of life. His temper became so much more irascible and furious, that no one approached him without fear, and he was propitiated by the most extravagant flatteries[2]. At length he roused himself and found his true consolation, in gratifying the primary passions of his nature—fighting and man-hunting[3].

[1] Arrian, vii. 14; Plutarch, Alex. 72; Diodor. xvii. 110. It will not do to follow the canon of evidence tacitly assumed by Arrian, who thinks himself authorised to discredit all the details of Alexander's conduct on this occasion, which transgress the limits of a dignified, though vehement sorrow.

When Masistius was slain in the Persian army commanded by Mardonius in Bœotia, the manes of the horses were cut, as token of mourning: compare also Plutarch, Pelopidas, 33; and Euripid. Alkestis, 442.

[2] See the curious extracts from Ephippus the Chalkidian,—seemingly a contemporary, if not an eye-witness (ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 537, 538)—εὐφημία δὲ καὶ σιγὴ κατεῖχε πάντας ὑπὸ δέους τοὺς παρόντας· ἀφάρητος γὰρ ἦν (Alexander) καὶ φονικός· ἐδύκει γὰρ εἶναι μελαγχολικὸς, &c.

[3] I translate here, literally, Plutarch's expression—Τοῦ δὲ πένθους παρηγορίᾳ τῷ πολεμῷ χρώμενος, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ θήραν καὶ κυνηγέσιον ἀνθρώπων ἐξῆλθε, καὶ τὸ Κοσσαίων ἔθνος κατεστρέψατο, πάντας

Between Media and Persis, dwelt the tribes called Kossæi, amidst a region of lofty, trackless, inaccessible mountains. Brave and predatory, they had defied the attacks of the Persian kings. Alexander now conducted against them a powerful force, and in spite of increased difficulties arising from the wintry season, pushed them from point to point, following them into the loftiest and most impenetrable recesses of their mountains. These efforts were continued for forty days, under himself and Ptolemy, until the entire male population was slain; which passed for an acceptable offering to the manes of Hephæstion[1].

B.C. 323, winter—spring.

March of Alexander to Babylon. Numerous embassies which met him on the way.

Not long afterwards, Alexander commenced his progress to Babylon; but in slow marches, farther retarded by various foreign embassies which met him on the road. So widely had the terror of his name and achievements been spread, that several of these envoys came from the most distant regions. There were some from the various tribes of Libya —from Carthage—from Sicily and Sardinia—from the Illyrians and Thracians—from the Lucanians, Bruttians, and Tuscans, in Italy—nay, even (some affirmed) from the Romans, as yet a people of moderate power[2]. But there were other nations yet

ἡβηδὸν ἀποσφάττων. Τοῦτο δὲ Ἡφαιστίωνος ἐναγισμὸς ἐκαλεῖτο (Plutarch, Alexand. 72: compare Polyænus, iv. 3, 31).

[1] Arrian, vii. 15; Plutarch, Alex. 72; Diodor. xvii. 111. This general slaughter, however, can only be true of portions of the Kossæan name; for Kossæans occur in after years (Diodor. xix. 19).

[2] Pliny, H. N. iii. 9. The story in Strabo, v. p. 232, can hardly apply to Alexander the Great. Livy (ix. 18) conceives that the Romans knew nothing of Alexander even by report, but this appears to me not credible.

On the whole, though the point is doubtful, I incline to believe the

more surprising—Æthiopians, from the extreme south, beyond Egypt—Scythians from the north, beyond the Danube—Iberians and Gauls, from the far west, beyond the Mediterranean Sea. Legates also arrived from various Grecian cities, partly to tender congratulations and compliments upon his matchless successes, partly to remonstrate against his sweeping mandate for the general restoration of the Grecian exiles[1]. It was remarked that these Grecian legates approached him with wreaths on their heads, tendering golden wreaths to him,—as if they were coming into the presence of a god[2]. The proofs which Alexander received, even from distant tribes with names and costumes unknown to him, of fear for his enmity and anxiety for his favour, were such as had never been shown to any historical person, and such as entirely to explain his superhuman arrogance.

In the midst of this exuberant pride and good fortune, however, dark omens and prophecies crowded upon him as he approached Babylon. Of

B.C. 323, spring.

assertion of a Roman embassy to Alexander. Nevertheless, there were various false statements which afterwards became current about it—one of which may be seen in Memnon's history of the Pontic Herakleia ap. Photium, Cod. 224; Orelli Fragment. Memnon, p. 36. Kleitarchus (contemporary of Alexander), whom Pliny quotes, can have had no motive to insert falsely the name of Romans, which in his time was nowise important.

[1] Arrian, vii. 15; Justin, xii. 13; Diodor. xvii. 113. The story mentioned by Justin in another place (xxi. 6) is probably referable to this last season of Alexander's career. A Carthaginian named Hamilkar Rhodanus was sent by his city to Alexander; really as an emissary to acquaint himself with the king's real designs, which occasioned to the Carthaginians serious alarm—but under colour of being an exile tendering his services. Justin says that Parmenio introduced Hamilkar—which must, I think, be an error.

[2] Arrian, vii. 19, 1; vii. 23, 3.

Alexander at Babylon —his great preparations for the circumnavigation and conquest of Arabia.

these the most remarkable was, the warning of the Chaldean priests, who apprised him, soon after he crossed the Tigris, that it would be dangerous for him to enter that city, and exhorted him to remain outside of the gates. At first he was inclined to obey; but his scruples were overruled, either by arguments from the Greek sophist Anaxarchus, or by the shame of shutting himself out from the most memorable city of the empire, where his great naval preparations were now going on. He found Nearchus with his fleet, who had come up from the mouth of the river,—and also the ships directed to be built in Phenicia, which had come down the river from Thapsakus, together with large numbers of seafaring men to serve aboard[1]. The ships of cypress-wood, and the large docks, which he had ordered to be constructed at Babylon, were likewise in full progress. He lost no time in concerting with Nearchus the details of an expedition into Arabia and the Persian Gulf, by his land force and naval force cooperating. From various naval officers, who had been sent to survey the Persian Gulf and now made their reports, he learnt, that though there were no serious difficulties within it or along its southern coast, yet to double the eastern cape which terminated that coast—to circumnavigate the unknown peninsula of Arabia,—and thus to reach the Red Sea—was an enterprise perilous at least, if not impracticable[2]. But to achieve that which other

[1] Arrian, vii. 19, 5-12; Diodor. xvii. 112.

[2] Arrian, vii. 20, 15; Arrian, Indica, 43. To undertake this circumnavigation, Alexander had despatched a ship-master of Soli in Cyprus, named Hiero; who, becoming alarmed at the distance to which he was

men thought impracticable, was the leading passion of Alexander. He resolved to circumnavigate Arabia as well as to conquer the Arabians, from whom it was sufficient offence that they had sent no envoys to him. He also contemplated the foundation of a great maritime city in the interior of the Persian Gulf, to rival in wealth and commerce the cities of Phenicia[1].

B.C. 323, April, May. Alexander on shipboard, on the Euphrates and in the marshes adjoining. His plans for improving the navigation and flow of the river.

Amidst preparations for this expedition—and while the immense funeral pile destined for Hephæstion was being built—Alexander sailed down the Euphrates to the great dyke called Pallakopas, about ninety miles below Babylon; a sluice constructed by the ancient Assyrian kings, for the purpose of being opened when the river was too full, so as to let off the water into the interminable marshes stretching out near the western bank. The sluice being reported not to work well, he projected the construction of a new one somewhat farther down. He then sailed through the Pallakopas in order to survey the marshes, together with the tombs of the ancient Assyrian kings which had been erected among them. Himself steering his vessel, with the kausia on his head, and the regal diadem above it[2], he passed some time among these lakes and swamps, which were so extensive that his fleet lost the way among them. He stayed long

advancing, and at the apparently interminable stretch of Arabia towards the south, returned without accomplishing the object.

Even in the time of Arrian, in the second century after the Christian era, Arabia had never been circumnavigated, from the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea—at least so far as his knowledge extended.

[1] Arrian, vii. 19, 11.

[2] Arrian, vii. 22, 2, 3; Strabo, xvi. p. 741.

enough also to direct, and even commence, the foundation of a new city, in what seemed to him a convenient spot[1].

B.C. 323, June. Large reinforcements arrive, Grecian and Asiatic. New array ordered by Alexander, for Macedonians and Persians in the same files and companies.

On returning to Babylon, Alexander found large reinforcements arrived there—partly under Philoxenus, Menander, and Menidas, from Lydia and Karia—partly 20,000 Persians, under Peukestes the satrap. He caused these Persians to be incorporated in the files of the Macedonian phalanx. According to the standing custom, each of these files was sixteen deep, and each soldier was armed with the long pike or sarissa wielded by two hands; the lochage, or front-rank man, being always an officer receiving double pay, of great strength and attested valour—and those second and third in the file, as well as the rearmost man of all, being likewise strong and good men, receiving larger pay than the rest. Alexander, in his new arrangement, retained the three first ranks and the rear rank unchanged, as well as the same depth of file; but he substituted twelve Persians in place of the twelve Macedonians who followed after the third-rank man; so that the file was composed first of the lochage and two other chosen Macedonians, each armed with the sarissa—then of twelve Persians armed in their own manner with bow or javelin—lastly, of a Macedonian with his sarissa bringing up the rear[2]. In this Macedonico-Persian file, the front would have only three projecting pikes,

[1] Arrian, vii. 21, 11. πόλιν ἐξῳκοδόμησέ τε καὶ ἐτείχισε.

[2] Arrian, vii. 23, 5. Even when performing the purely military operation of passing these soldiers in review, inspecting their exercise, and determining their array,—Alexander sat upon the regal throne, surrounded by Asiatic eunuchs; his principal officers sat upon couches

instead of five, as the ordinary Macedonian phalanx presented; but then, in compensation, the Persian soldiers would be able to hurl their javelins at an advancing enemy, over the heads of their three front-rank men. The supervening death of Alexander prevented the actual execution of this reform, interesting as being his last project for amalgamating Persians and Macedonians into one military force.

Splendid funeral obsequies of Hephæstion.

Besides thus modifying the phalanx, Alexander also passed in review his fleet, which was now fully equipped. The order was actually given for departing, so soon as the obsequies of Hephæstion should be celebrated. This was the last act which remained for him to fulfil. The splendid funeral pile stood ready—two hundred feet high, occupying a square area, of which the side was nearly one furlong, loaded with costly decorations from the zeal, real and simulated, of the Macedonian officers. The invention of artists was exhausted, in long discussions with the king himself, to produce at all cost an exhibition of magnificence singular and stupendous. The outlay (probably with addition of the festivals immediately following) is stated at 12,000 talents, or £2,760,000 sterling[1]. Alexander awaited the order from the oracle of Ammon, having sent thither messengers to inquire what measure of reverential honour he might properly and piously show to his departed friend[2]. The answer was now brought back, intimating that Hephæstion was to be worshiped as a Hero—the

with silver feet, near to him (Arrian, vii. 24, 4). This is among the evidences of his altered manners.

[1] Diodorus, xvii. 115; Plutarch, Alex. 72.

[2] Arrian, vii. 23, 8.

secondary form of worship, not on a level with that paid to the Gods. Delighted with this divine testimony to Hephæstion, Alexander caused the pile to be lighted, and the obsequies celebrated, in a manner suitable to the injunctions of the oracle[1]. He farther directed that magnificent chapels or sacred edifices should be erected for the worship and honour of Hephæstion, at Alexandria in Egypt,—at Pella in Macedonia,—and probably in other cities also[2].

Respecting the honours intended for Hephæstion at Alexandria, he addressed to Kleomenes the satrap of Egypt a despatch which becomes in part known to us. I have already stated that Kleomenes was among the worst of the satraps; having committed multiplied public crimes, of which Alexander was not uninformed. The regal despatch enjoined him to erect in commemoration of Hephæstion a chapel on the terra firma of Alexandria, with a

[1] Diodor. xvii. 114, 115: compare Arrian, vii. 14, 16; Plutarch, Alex. 75.

[2] Arrian, vii. 23, 10–13; Diod. xviii. 4. Diodorus speaks indeed, in this passage, of the πυρὰ or funeral pile in honour of Hephæstion, as if it were among the vast expences included among the memoranda left by Alexander (after his decease) of prospective schemes. But the funeral pile had already been erected at Babylon, as Diodorus himself had informed us. What Alexander left unexecuted at his decease, but intended to execute if he had lived, was the splendid edifices and chapels in Hephæstion's honour—as we see by Arrian, vii. 23, 10. And Diodorus must be supposed to allude to these intended sacred buildings, though he has inadvertently spoken of the funeral pile. Kraterus, who was under orders to return to Macedonia, was to have built one at Pella.

The Olynthian Ephippus had composed a book περὶ τῆς Ἡφαιστίωνος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ταφῆς, of which there appear four or five citations in Athenæus. He dwelt especially on the luxurious habits of Alexander, and on his unmeasured potations—common to him with other Macedonians.

splendid turret in the islet of Pharos; and to provide besides that all mercantile written contracts, as a condition of validity, should be inscribed with the name of Hephæstion. Alexander concluded thus:—"If on coming I find the Egyptian temples and the chapels of Hephæstion completed in the best manner, I will forgive you for all your past crimes; and in future, whatever magnitude of crime you may commit, you shall suffer no bad treatment from me[1]." This despatch strikingly illustrates how much the wrong doings of satraps were secondary considerations in his view, compared with splendid manifestations towards the Gods and personal attachment towards friends.

The intense sorrow felt by Alexander for the death of Hephæstion — not merely an attached friend, but of the same age and exuberant vigour as himself—laid his mind open to gloomy forebodings from numerous omens, as well as to jealous mistrust even of his oldest officers. Antipater especially, no longer protected against the calumnies of Olympias by the support of Hephæstion[2], fell more and more into discredit; whilst his son Kassander, who had recently come into Asia with a Macedonian reinforcement, underwent from Alexander

[1] Arrian, vii. 23, 9–14. *Καὶ Κλεομένει ἀνδρὶ κακῷ, καὶ πολλὰ ἀδικήματα ἀδικήσαντι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἐπιστέλλει ἐπιστολήν..... Ἢν γὰρ καταλάβω ἐγὼ (ἔλεγε τὰ γράμματα) τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καλῶς κατεσκευασμένα καὶ τὰ ἡρῷα τὰ Ἡφαιστίωνος, εἴτε τι πρότερον ἡμάρτηκας, ἀφήσω σε τούτων, καὶ τόλοιπον, ὁπήλικον ἂν ἁμάρτῃς, οὐδὲν πείσῃ ἐξ ἐμοῦ ἄχαρι.*— In the oration of Demosthenes against Dionysodoras (p. 1285), Kleomenes appears as enriching himself by the monopoly of corn exported from Egypt: compare Pseudo-Aristot. Œconom. c. 33. Kleomenes was afterwards put to death by the first Ptolemy, who became king of Egypt (Pausanias, i. 6, 3). [2] Plutarch, Alex. 74; Diodor. xvii. 114.

during irascible moments much insulting violence. In spite of the dissuasive warning of the Chaldean priests[1], Alexander had been persuaded to distrust their sincerity, and had entered Babylon, though not without hesitation and uneasiness. However, when, after having entered the town, he went out of it again safely on his expedition for the survey of the lower Euphrates, he conceived himself to have exposed them as deceitful alarmists, and returned to the city with increased confidence, for the obsequies of his deceased friend[2].

B.C. 323, June.

General feasting and intemperance in the army. Alexander is seized with a dangerous fever. Details of his illness.

The sacrifices connected with these obsequies were on the most prodigious scale. Victims enough were offered to furnish a feast for the army, who also received ample distributions of wine. Alexander himself presided at the feast, and abandoned himself to conviviality like the rest. Already full of wine, he was persuaded by his friend Medius to sup with him, and to pass the whole night in yet farther

[1] Arrian, vii. 16, 9; vii. 17, 6. Plutarch, Alex. 73. Diodor. xvii. 112.

[2] Arrian, vii. 22, 1. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὡς ἐξελέγξας δὴ τῶν Χαλδαίων μαντείαν, ὅτι οὐδὲν πεπονθὼς εἴη ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἄχαρι (ἀλλ' ἔφθη γὰρ ἐλάσας ἔξω Βαβυλῶνος πρὶν τι παθεῖν) ἀνέπλει αὖθις κατὰ τὰ ἕλη θαῤῥῶν, &c.

The uneasiness here caused by these prophecies and omens, in the mind of the most fearless man of his age, is worthy of notice as a psychological fact, and is perfectly attested by the authority of Aristobulus and Nearchus. It appears that Anaxarchus and other Grecian philosophers encouraged him by their reasonings to despise all prophecy, but especially that of the Chaldæan priests; who (they alleged) wished to keep Alexander out of Babylon in order that they might continue to possess the large revenues of the temple of Belus, which they had wrongfully appropriated; Alexander being disposed to rebuild that ruined temple, and to re-establish the suspended sacrifices to which its revenues had been originally devoted (Arrian, vii. 17; Diodor. xvii. 112). Not many days afterwards, Alexander greatly repented of having given way to these dangerous reasoners, who by their sophistical cavils set aside the power and the warnings of destiny (Diodor. xvii. 116).

drinking, with the boisterous indulgence called by the Greeks Kômus or Revelry. Having slept off his intoxication during the next day, he in the evening again supped with Medius, and spent a second night in the like unmeasured indulgence[1]. It appears that he already had the seeds of fever upon him, which was so fatally aggravated by this intemperance that he was too ill to return to his palace. He took the bath, and slept in the house of Medius; on the next morning, he was unable to rise. After having been carried out on a couch to celebrate sacrifice (which was his daily habit), he was obliged to lie in bed all day. Nevertheless he summoned the generals to his presence, prescribing all the details of the impending expedition, and ordering that the land-force should begin its march on the fourth day following, while the fleet, with himself aboard, would sail on the fifth day. In the evening, he was carried on a couch across the Euphrates into a garden on the other side, where he bathed and rested for the night. The fever still continued, so that in the morning, after bathing and being carried out to perform the sacrifices, he remained on his couch all day, talking and playing at dice with Me-

[1] Arrian, vii. 24, 25. Diodorus states (xvii. 117) that Alexander, on this convivial night, swallowed the contents of a large goblet called the cup of Herakles, and felt very ill after it; a statement repeated by various other writers of antiquity, and which I see no reason for discrediting, though some modern critics treat it with contempt. The Royal Ephemerides, or Court Journal, attested only the general fact of his large potations and the long sleep which followed them: see Athenæus, x. p. 434.

To drink to intoxication at a funeral, was required as a token of respectful sympathy towards the deceased—see the last words of the Indian Kalanus before he ascended the funeral pile—Plutarch, Alexander, 69.

dius; in the evening, he bathed, sacrificed again, and ate a light supper, but endured a bad night with increased fever. The next two days passed in the same manner, the fever becoming worse and worse; nevertheless Alexander still summoned Nearchus to his bedside, discussed with him many points about his maritime projects, and repeated his order that the fleet should be ready by the third day. On the ensuing morning the fever was violent; Alexander reposed all day in a bathing-house in the garden, yet still calling in the generals to direct the filling up of vacancies among the officers, and ordering that the armament should be ready to move. Throughout the two next days, his malady became hourly more aggravated. On the last of the two, Alexander could with difficulty support the being lifted out of bed to perform the sacrifice; even then, however, he continued to give orders to the generals about the expedition. On the morrow, though desperately ill, he still made the effort requisite for performing the sacrifice; he was then carried across from the garden-house to the palace, giving orders that the generals and officers should remain in permanent attendance in and near the hall. He caused some of them to be called to his bedside; but though he knew them perfectly, he had by this time become incapable of utterance. One of his last words spoken is said to have been, on being asked to whom he bequeathed his kingdom, "*To the strongest*;" one of his last acts was, to take the signet ring from his finger, and hand it to Perdikkas[1].

[1] These last two facts are mentioned by Arrian (vii. 26, 5) and Dio-

For two nights and a day he continued in this state, without either amendment or repose. Meanwhile, the news of his malady had spread through the army, filling them with grief and consternation. Many of the soldiers, eager to see him once more, forced their way into the palace, and were admitted unarmed. They passed along by the bedside, with all the demonstrations of affliction and sympathy: Alexander knew them, and made show of friendly recognition as well as he could; but was unable to say a word. Several of the generals slept in the temple of Serapis, hoping to be informed by the God in a dream whether they ought to bring Alexander into it, as a suppliant to experience the divine healing power. The God informed them in their dream, that Alexander ought not to be brought into the temple—that it would be better for him to be left where he was. In the afternoon he expired —June 323 B.C.—after a life of thirty-two years and eight months—and a reign of twelve years and eight months[1].

No hope of his life. Consternation and grief in the army. Last interview with the soldiers. His death.

The death of Alexander, thus suddenly cut off B.C. 323.

dorus (xvii. 117), and Justin (xii. 15): but they found no place in the Court Journal. Curtius (x. v. 4) gives them with some enlargement.

[1] The details, respecting the last illness of Alexander, are peculiarly authentic, being extracted both by Arrian and by Plutarch, from the Ephemerides Regiæ, or short Court Journal; which was habitually kept by his secretary Eumenes, and another Greek named Diodotus (Athenæ. x. p. 434): see Arrian, vii. 25, 26; Plutarch, Alex. 76.

It is surprising that throughout all the course of this malady, no mention is made of any physician as having been consulted. No advice was asked; if we except the application to the temple of Serapis, during the last day of Alexander's life. A few months before, Alexander had hanged or crucified the physician who attended Hephæstion in his last illness. Hence it seems probable that he either despised or mistrusted medical advice, and would not permit any to be invoked.

Effect produced on the imagination of contemporaries by the career and death of Alexander.

by a fever in the plenitude of health, vigour, and aspirations, was an event impressive as well as important, in the highest possible degree, to his contemporaries far and near. When the first report of it was brought to Athens, the orator Demades exclaimed—"It cannot be true: if Alexander were dead, the whole habitable world would have smelt of his carcass[1]." This coarse, but emphatic comparison, illustrates the immediate, powerful, and wide-reaching impression produced by the sudden extinction of the great conqueror. It was felt by each of the many remote envoys who had so re-

His views must have been much altered since his dangerous fever at Tarsus, and the successful treatment of it by the Akarnanian physician Philippus.

Though the fever (see some remarks from Littré attached to Didot's Fragm. Script. Alex. Magn. p. 124) which caused Alexander's death is here a plain fact satisfactorily made out, yet a different story was circulated some time afterwards, and gained partial credit (Plutarch De Invidiâ, p. 538), that he had been poisoned. The poison was said to have been provided by Aristotle,—sent over to Asia by Antipater through his son Kassander,—and administered by Iollas (another son of Antipater), Alexander's cupbearer (Arrian, vii. 27, 2; Curtius, x. 10, 17; Diodor. xvii. 118; Justin, xii. 13). It is quite natural that fever and intemperance (which latter moreover was frequent with Alexander) should not be regarded as causes sufficiently marked and impressive to explain a decease at once so unexpected and so momentous. There seems ground for supposing, however, that the report was intentionally fomented, if not originally broached, by the party-enemies of Antipater and Kassander—especially by the rancorous Olympias. The violent enmity afterwards displayed by Kassander against Olympias, and all the family of Alexander, helped to encourage the report. In the life of Hyperides in Plutarch (Vit. X. Orat. p. 849) it is stated, that he proposed at Athens public honours to Iollas for having given the poison to Alexander. If there is any truth in this, it might be a stratagem for casting discredit on Antipater (father of Iollas), against whom the Athenians entered into the Lamian war, immediately after the death of Alexander.

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 22; Demetrius Phaler. De Elocution. s. 300. *Οὐ τέθνηκεν Ἀλέξανδρος, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι—ὥζε γὰρ ἂν ἡ οἰκουμένη τοῦ νεκροῦ.*

cently come to propitiate this far-shooting Apollo—by every man among the nations who had sent these envoys—throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa, as then known,—to affect either his actual condition or his probable future[1]. The first growth and development of Macedonia, during the twenty-two years preceding the battle of Chæroneia, from an embarrassed secondary state into the first of all known powers, had excited the astonishment of contemporaries, and admiration for Philip's organizing genius. But the achievements of Alexander, during his twelve years of reign, throwing Philip into the shade, had been on a scale so much grander and vaster, and so completely without serious reverse or even interruption, as to transcend the measure, not only of human expectation, but almost of human belief. The Great King (as the King of Persia was called by excellence) was, and had long been, the type of worldly power and felicity, even down to the time when Alexander crossed the Hellespont. Within four years and three months from this event, by one stupendous defeat after another, Darius had lost all his Western Empire, and had become a fugitive eastward of the Caspian Gates, escaping captivity at the hands of Alexander only to perish by those of the satrap Bessus. All antecedent historical parallels—the ruin and captivity of the Lydian Crœsus, the expulsion and mean life of the Syracusan Dionysius, both of them

[1] Dionysius, despot of the Pontic Herakleia, fainted away with joy when he heard of Alexander's death, and erected a statue of Εὐθυμία or Comfort (Memn. Herael. Fragm. ap. Photium, Cod. 224. c. 4).

impressive examples of the mutability of human condition,—sank into trifles compared with the overthrow of this towering Persian colossus. The orator Æschines expressed the genuine sentiment of a Grecian spectator, when he exclaimed (in a speech delivered at Athens shortly before the death of Darius)—"What is there among the list of strange and unexpected events, that has not occurred in our time? Our lives have transcended the limits of humanity; we are born to serve as a theme for incredible tales to posterity. Is not the Persian king—who dug through Athos and bridged the Hellespont,—who demanded earth and water from the Greeks,—who dared to proclaim himself in public epistles master of all mankind from the rising to the setting sun—Is not *he* now struggling to the last, not for dominion over others, but for the safety of his own person[1]?"

Such were the sentiments excited by Alexander's career even in the middle of 330 B.C., more than seven years before his death. During the following seven years, his additional achievements had carried astonishment yet farther. He had mastered, in defiance of fatigue, hardship, and combat, not merely

[1] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 524. c. 43. Τοιγάρτοι τί τῶν ἀνελπίστων καὶ ἀπροσδοκήτων ἐφ' ἡμῶν οὐ γέγονεν! οὐ γὰρ βίον γ' ἡμεῖς ἀνθρώπινον βεβιώκαμεν, ἀλλ' εἰς παραδοξολογίαν τοῖς ἐσομένοις μεθ' ἡμᾶς ἔφυμεν. Οὐχ ὁ μὲν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεὺς, ὁ τὸν Ἄθων διορύξας καὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ζεύξας, ὁ γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ τοὺς Ἕλληνας αἰτῶν, ὁ τολμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γράφειν ὅτι δεσπότης ἐστὶν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνίοντος μέχρι δυομένου, νῦν οὐ περὶ τοῦ κύριος ἑτέρων εἶναι διαγωνίζεται, ἀλλ' ἤδη περὶ τῆς τοῦ σώματος σωτηρίας;

Compare the striking fragment, of a like tenor, out of the lost work of the Phalerean Demetrius—Περὶ τῆς τύχης—Fragment. Histor. Græcor. vol. ii. p. 368.

all the eastern half of the Persian empire, but unknown Indian regions beyond its easternmost limits. Besides Macedonia, Greece, and Thrace, he possessed all that immense treasure and military force which had once rendered the Great King so formidable. By no contemporary man had any such power ever been known or conceived. With the turn of imagination then prevalent, many were doubtless disposed to take him for a God on earth, as Grecian spectators had once supposed with regard to Xerxes, when they beheld the innumerable Persian host crossing the Hellespont[1].

Had Alexander lived, he must have achieved things greater still.

Exalted to this prodigious grandeur, Alexander was at the time of his death little more than thirty-two years old—the age at which a citizen of Athens was growing into important commands; ten years less than the age for a consul at Rome[2]; two years younger than the age at which Timour first acquired the crown, and began his foreign conquests[3]. His extraordinary bodily powers were unabated; he had acquired a large stock of military experience; and what was still more important, his appetite for farther conquest was as voracious, and his readiness to purchase it at the largest cost of toil or danger, as complete, as it had been when he first crossed the Hellespont. Great as his past career had been, his future achievements, with such increased means and experience, were likely to be yet greater. His ambition would have been satisfied with nothing less than the conquest of the whole habitable world

[1] Herodot. vii. 56.

[2] Cicero, Philippic. v. 17, 48.

[3] See Histoire de Timour-Bec, par Cherefeddin Ali, translated by Petit de la Croix, vol. i. p. 203.

as then known[1]; and if his life had been prolonged, he would probably have accomplished it. Nowhere (so far as our knowledge reaches) did there reside any military power capable of making head against him; nor were his soldiers, when he commanded them, daunted or baffled by any extremity of cold, heat, or fatigue. The patriotic feelings of Livy dispose him to maintain[2] that Alexander, had he invaded Italy and assailed Romans or Samnites, would have failed and perished like his relative Alexander of Epirus. But this conclusion cannot be accepted. If we grant the courage and discipline of the Roman infantry to have been equal to the best infantry of Alexander's army, the same cannot be said of the Roman cavalry as compared with the Macedonian Companions. Still less is it likely that a Roman consul, annually changed, would have been found a match for Alexander in military genius and combinations; nor, even if personally equal, would he have possessed the same variety of troops and arms, each effective in its separate way, and all conspiring to one common purpose—nor the same unbounded influence over their minds in stimulating them to full effort. I do not think that even the

Question raised by Livy, about the chances of Alexander if he had attacked the Romans.

[1] This is the remark of his great admirer Arrian, vii. 1, 6.

[2] Livy, ix. 17-19. A discussion of Alexander's chances against the Romans—extremely interesting and beautiful, though the case appears to me very partially set forth. I agree with Niebuhr in dissenting from Livy's result; and with Plutarch in considering it as one of the boons of Fortune to the Romans, that Alexander did not live long enough to attack them (Plutarch De Fortunâ Romanor. p. 326).

Livy however had great reason for complaining of those Greek authors (he calls them "levissimi ex Græcis") who said that the Romans would have quailed before the terrible reputation of Alexander, and submitted without resistance. Assuredly his victory over them would have been dearly bought.

Romans could have successfully resisted Alexander the Great; though it is certain that he never throughout all his long marches encountered such enemies as they, nor even such as Samnites and Lucanians—combining courage, patriotism, discipline, with effective arms both for defence and for close combat[1].

Unrivalled excellence of Alexander, as a military man.

Among all the qualities which go to constitute the highest military excellence, either as a general or as a soldier, none was wanting in the character of Alexander. Together with his own chivalrous courage—sometimes indeed both excessive and unseasonable, so as to form the only military defect which can be fairly imputed to him—we trace in all his operations the most careful dispositions taken beforehand, vigilant precaution in guarding against possible reverse, and abundant resource in adapting himself to new contingences. Amidst constant success, these precautionary combinations were never discontinued. His achievements are the earliest recorded evidence of scientific military organization on a large scale, and of its overwhelming effects. Alexander overawes the imagination more than any other personage of antiquity, by the matchless development of all that constitutes effective force—as an individual warrior, and as organizer and leader of armed masses; not merely the blind impetuosity ascribed by Homer to Ares, but also the intelligent, methodized, and all-subduing

[1] Alexander of Epirus is said to have remarked, that he, in his expeditions into Italy, had fallen upon the ἀνδρωνῖτις or chamber of the men; while his nephew (Alexander the Great), in invading Asia, had fallen upon the γυναικωνῖτις or chamber of the women (Aulus Gellius, xvii. 21; Curtius, viii. 1, 37).

compression which he personifies in Athênê. But all his great qualities were fit for use only against enemies; in which category indeed were numbered all mankind, known and unknown, except those who chose to submit to him. In his Indian campaigns, amidst tribes of utter strangers, we perceive that not only those who stand on their defence, but also those who abandon their property and flee to the mountains, are alike pursued and slaughtered.

Alexander as a ruler, apart from military affairs — not deserving of esteem.

Apart from the transcendent merits of Alexander as a soldier and a general, some authors give him credit for grand and beneficent views on the subject of imperial government, and for intentions highly favourable to the improvement of mankind. I see no ground for adopting this opinion. As far as we can venture to anticipate what would have been Alexander's future, we see nothing in prospect except years of ever-repeated aggression and conquest, not to be concluded until he had traversed and subjugated all the inhabited globe. The acquisition of universal dominion — conceived not metaphorically, but literally, and conceived with greater facility in consequence of the imperfect geographical knowledge of the time — was the master-passion of his soul. At the moment of his death, he was commencing fresh aggression in the south against the Arabians, to an indefinite extent[1]; while his vast projects against the western tribes in Africa and Europe, as far as the pillars of Herakles, were consigned in the orders and memoranda confidentially communicated to Kraterus[2]. Italy, Gaul, and Spain, would have been successively attacked

[1] Arrian, vii. 28, 5.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 4.

and conquered; the enterprises proposed to him when in Baktria by the Chorasmian prince Pharasmanes, but postponed then until a more convenient season, would have been next taken up, and he would have marched from the Danube northward round the Euxine and Palus Mæotis against the Scythians and the tribes of Caucasus[1]. There remained moreover the Asiatic regions east of the Hyphasis, which his soldiers had refused to enter upon, but which he certainly would have invaded at a future opportunity, were it only to efface the poignant humiliation of having been compelled to relinquish his proclaimed purpose. Though this sounds like romance and hyperbole, it was nothing more than the real insatiate aspiration of Alexander, who looked upon every new acquisition mainly as a capital for acquiring more[2]. "You are a man like all of us, Alexander—except that you abandon your home (said the naked Indian to him[3]) like a meddlesome destroyer, to invade the most distant regions; enduring hardship yourself, and inflicting hardship upon others." Now, how an empire thus boundless and heterogeneous, such as no prince has ever yet realized, could have been administered

[1] Arrian, iv. 15, 11.

[2] Arrian, vii. 19, 12. Τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς, ὥς γέ μοι δοκεῖ, ἄπληστος ἦν τοῦ κτᾶσθαί τι ἀεὶ Ἀλέξανδρος. Compare vii. 1. 3–7; vii. 15, 6, and the speech made by Alexander to his soldiers on the banks of the Hyphasis, when he was trying to persuade them to march forward, v. 26 *seq.* We must remember that Arrian had before him the work of Ptolemy, who would give, in all probability, the substance of this memorable speech from his own hearing.

[3] Arrian, vii. 1, 8. σὺ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὢν, παραπλήσιος τοῖς ἄλλοις, πλήν γε δὴ, ὅτι πολυπράγμων καὶ ἀτάσθαλος, ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας τοσαύτην γῆν ἐπεξέρχῃ, πράγματα ἔχων τε καὶ παρέχων ἄλλοις.

with any superior advantages to subjects—it would be difficult to show. The mere task of acquiring and maintaining—of keeping satraps and tribute-gatherers in authority as well as in subordination—of suppressing resistances ever liable to recur in regions distant by months of march[1]—would occupy the whole life of a world-conqueror, without leaving any leisure for the improvements suited to peace and stability, if we give him credit for such purposes in theory.

Alexander would have continued the system of the Persian empire, with no other improvement except that of a strong organization.

But even this last is more than can be granted. Alexander's acts indicate that he desired nothing better than to take up the traditions of the Persian empire; a tribute-levying and army-levying system, under Macedonians, in large proportion, as his instruments; yet partly also under the very same Persians who had administered before, provided they submitted to him. It has indeed been extolled among his merits that he was thus willing to re-appoint Persian grandees (putting their armed force however under the command of a Macedonian officer)—and to continue native princes in their dominions, if they did willing homage to him, as tributary subordinates. But all this had been done before him by the Persian kings, whose system it was to leave the conquered princes undisturbed, subject only to the payment of tribute, and to the obligation of furnishing a military contingent when required[2]. In like manner Alexander's Asiatic em-

[1] Arrian, vii. 4, 4, 5.

[2] Herodot. iii. 15. Alexander offered to Phokion (Plutarch, Phok. 18) his choice between four Asiatic cities, of which (that is, of any one of them) he was to enjoy the revenues; just as Artaxerxes Longimanus

pire would thus have been composed of an aggregate of satrapies and dependent principalities, furnishing money and soldiers; in other respects, left to the discretion of local rule, with occasional extreme inflictions of punishment, but no systematic examination or control[1]. Upon this, the condition of Asiatic empire in all ages, Alexander would have grafted one special improvement: the military organization of the empire, feeble under the Achæmenid princes, would have been greatly strengthened by his genius, and by the able officers formed in his school, both for foreign aggression and for home control[2].

Absence of nationality in Alexander—purpose of fusing the different varieties of mankind into one common type of subjection.

The Persian empire was a miscellaneous aggregate, with no strong feeling of nationality. The Macedonian conqueror who seized its throne was still more indifferent to national sentiment. He was neither Macedonian nor Greek. Though the absence of this prejudice has sometimes been counted to him as a virtue, it only made room, in my opinion, for prejudices yet worse. The substitute for it was an exorbitant personality and self-estimation, manifested even in his earliest years, and inflamed by extraordinary success into the belief in divine parentage; which, while setting him above the idea of communion with any special nationality, made him conceive all man-

had acted towards Themistokles, in recompense for his treason. Phokion refused the offer.

[1] See the punishment of Sisamnes by Kambyses (Herodot. v. 25).

[2] The rhetor Aristeides, in his Encomium on Rome, has some good remarks on the character and ascendency of Alexander, exercised by will and personal authority, as contrasted with the systematic and legal working of the Roman empire (Orat. xiv. p. 332-360, vol. i. ed. Dindorf).

kind as subjects under one common sceptre to be wielded by himself. To this universal empire the Persian king made the nearest approach[1], according to the opinions then prevalent. Accordingly Alexander, when victorious, accepted the position and pretensions of the overthrown Persian court as approaching most nearly to his full due. He became more Persian than either Macedonian or Greek. While himself adopting, as far as he could safely venture, the personal habits of the Persian court, he took studied pains to transform his Macedonian officers into Persian grandees, encouraging and even forcing intermarriages with Persian women according to Persian rites. At the time of Alexander's death, there was comprised, in his written orders given to Kraterus, a plan for the wholesale transportation of inhabitants both out of Europe into Asia, and out of Asia into Europe, in order to fuse these populations into one by multiplying intermarriages and intercourse[2]. Such reciprocal translation of peoples would have been felt as eminently odious, and could not have been accomplished without coercive authority[3]. It is

[1] Xenoph. Cyropæd. viii. 6, 21; Anabas. i. 7, 6; Herodot. vii. 8, 13: compare Arrian, v. 26, 4-10.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 4. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις πόλεων συνοικισμοὺς καὶ σωμάτων μεταγωγὰς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην, καὶ κατὰ τοὐναντίον ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, ὅπως τὰς μεγίστας ἠπείρους ταῖς ἐπιγαμίαις καὶ ταῖς οἰκειώσεσιν εἰς κοινὴν ὁμονοίαν καὶ συγγενικὴν φιλίαν καταστήσῃ.

[3] See the effect produced upon the Ionians by the false statement of Histiæus (Herodot. vi. 3) with Wesseling's note—and the eagerness of the Pæonians to return (Herod. v. 98; also Justin, viii. 5).

Antipater afterwards intended to transport the Ætolians in mass from their own country into Asia, if he had succeeded in conquering them (Diodor. xviii. 25). Compare Pausanias (i. 9, 8-10) about the forcible measures used by Lysimachus, in transporting new inhabitants, at Ephesus and Lysimacheia.

rash to speculate upon unexecuted purposes; but, as far as we can judge, such compulsory mingling of the different races promises nothing favourable to the happiness of any of them, though it might serve as an imposing novelty and memento of imperial omnipotence.

Mistake of supposing Alexander to be the intentional diffuser of Greek civilization. His ideas compared with those of Aristotle.

In respect of intelligence and combining genius, Alexander was Hellenic to the full; in respect of disposition and purpose, no one could be less Hellenic. The acts attesting his Oriental violence of impulse, unmeasured self-will[1], and exaction of reverence above the limits of humanity—have been already recounted. To describe him as a son of Hellas, imbued with the political maxims of Aristotle, and bent on the systematic diffusion of Hellenic culture for the improvement of mankind[2]—is, in my judgment, an estimate of his character contrary to the evidence. Alexander is indeed said to have invited suggestions from Aristotle as to the best mode of colonizing; but his temper altered so much, after a few years of Asiatic conquest, that

[1] Livy, ix. 18. "Referre in tanto rege piget superbam mutationem vestis, et desideratas humi jacentium adulationes, etiam victis Macedonibus graves, nedum victoribus: et fœda supplicia, et inter vinum et epulas cædes amicorum, et vanitatem ementiendæ stirpis. Quid si vini amor in dies fieret acrior? quid si trux et præfervida ira? (*nec quidquam dubium inter scriptores refero*) nullane hæc damna imperatoriis virtutibus ducimus?"

The appeal here made by Livy to the full attestation of these points in Alexander's character deserves notice. He had doubtless more authorities before him than we possess.

[2] Among other eulogists of Alexander, it is sufficient to name Droysen—in his two works, both of great historical research—Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen—and Geschichte des Hellenismus oder der Bildung des Hellenistischen Staaten Systemes (Hamburg, 1843). See especially the last and most recent work, p. 27 *seqq.* p. 651 *seqq.*—and elsewhere *passim.*

he came not only to lose all deference for Aristotle's advice, but even to hate him bitterly[1]. Moreover, though the philosopher's full suggestions have not been preserved, yet we are told generally that he recommended Alexander to behave to the Greeks as a leader or president, or limited chief—and to the Barbarians (non-Hellenes) as a master[2]; a distinction substantially coinciding with that pointed out by Burke in his speeches at the beginning of the American war, between the principles of government proper to be followed by England in the American colonies, and in British India. No Greek thinker believed the Asiatics to be capable of that free civil polity[3] upon which the march of every

[1] Plutarch, Alex. 55–74.

[2] Plutarch, Fortun. Alex. M. p. 329. Ἀλέξανδρος δε τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἔργον παρέσχεν· οὐ γὰρ, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης συνεβούλευεν αὐτῷ, τοῖς μὲν Ἕλλησιν ἡγεμονικῶς, τοῖς δὲ βαρβάροις δεσποτικῶς χρώμενόν.....ἀλλὰ κοινὸς ἥκειν θεόθεν ἁρμοστὴς καὶ διαλλακτὴς τῶν ὅλων νομίζων, οὓς τῷ λόγῳ μὴ συνῆγε, τοῖς ὅπλοις βιαζόμενος, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνενεγκὼν τὰ παντάχοθεν, &c.

Strabo (or Eratosthenes, see Strabo, i. p. 66) and Plutarch understand the expression of Aristotle erroneously—as if that philosopher had meant to recommend harsh and cruel treatment of the non-Hellenes, and kind treatment only towards Greeks. That Aristotle could have meant no such thing, is evident from the whole tenor of his treatise on Politics. The distinction really intended is between a greater and a less measure of extra-popular authority—not between kind and unkind purposes in the exercise of authority. Compare Tacitus, Annal. xii. 11—the advice of the Emperor Claudius to the Parthian prince Meherdates.

[3] Aristot. Politic. i. 1, 5; vii. 6, 1. See the memorable comparison drawn by Aristotle (Polit. vii. 6) between the Europeans and Asiatics generally. He pronounces the former to be courageous and energetic, but wanting in intelligence or powers of political combination; the latter to be intelligent, and clever in contrivance, but destitute of courage. Neither of them have more than a "one-legged aptitude" (φύσιν μονόκωλον); the Greek alone possesses both the courage and the intelligence united. The Asiatics are condemned to perpetual subjection; the Greeks might govern the world, could they but combine in one political society.

Grecian community was based. Aristotle did not wish to degrade the Asiatics below the level to which they had been accustomed, but rather to preserve the Greeks from being degraded to the same level. Now Alexander recognized no such distinction as that drawn by his preceptor. He treated Greeks and Asiatics alike, not by elevating the latter, but by degrading the former. Though he employed all indiscriminately as instruments, yet he presently found the free speech of Greeks, and even of Macedonians, so distasteful and offensive, that his preferences turned more and more in favour of the servile Asiatic sentiment and customs. Instead of hellenizing Asia, he was tending to asiatize Macedonia and Hellas. His temper and character, as modified by a few years of conquest, rendered him quite unfit to follow the course recommended by Aristotle towards the Greeks—quite as unfit as any of the Persian kings, or as the French Emperor Napoleon, to endure that partial frustration, compromise, and smart from free criticism, which is inseparable from the position of a limited chief. Among a multitude of subjects more diverse-coloured than even the army of Xerxes, it is quite possible that he might have turned his power towards the improvement of the rudest portions. We are told (though the fact is difficult to credit, from his want of time) that he abolished various barbarisms of the Hyrkanians, Arachosians, and Sogdians[1]. But Macedonians as

[1] Plutarch, Fortun. Alex. M. p. 328. The stay of Alexander in these countries was however so short, that even with the best will he could not have enforced the suppression of any inveterate customs.

well as Greeks would have been pure losers by being absorbed into an immense Asiatic aggregate.

Number of new cities founded in Asia by Alexander.

Plutarch states that Alexander founded more than seventy new cities in Asia[1]. So large a number of them is neither verifiable nor probable, unless we either reckon up simple military posts, or borrow from the list of foundations really established by his successors. Except Alexandria in Egypt, none of the cities founded by Alexander himself can be shown to have attained any great development. Nearly all were planted among the remote, warlike, and turbulent peoples eastward

[1] Plutarch, Fortun. Al. M. p. 328. Plutarch mentions, a few lines afterwards, Seleukeia in Mesopotamia, as if he thought that it was among the cities established by Alexander himself. This shows that he has not been exact in distinguishing foundations made by Alexander, from those originated by Seleukus and the other Diadochi.

The elaborate article of Droysen (in the Appendix to his Geschichte des Hellenismus, p. 588-651), ascribes to Alexander the largest plans of colonization in Asia, and enumerates a great number of cities alleged to have been founded by him. But in regard to the majority of these foundations, the evidence upon which Droysen grounds his belief that Alexander was the founder, appears to me altogether slender and unsatisfactory. If Alexander founded so many cities as Droysen imagines, how does it happen that Arrian mentions only so comparatively small a number? The argument derived from Arrian's silence, for rejecting what is affirmed by other ancients respecting Alexander, is indeed employed by modern authors (and by Droysen himself among them), far oftener than I think warrantable. But if there be any one proceeding of Alexander more than another, in respect of which the silence of Arrian ought to make us suspicious—it is the foundation of a new colony; a solemn act, requiring delay and multiplied regulations, intended for perpetuity, and redounding to the honour of the founder. I do not believe in any colonies founded by Alexander, beyond those comparatively few which Arrian mentions, except such as rest upon some other express and good testimony. Whoever will read through Droysen's list, will see that most of the names in it will not stand this test. The short life, and rapid movements, of Alexander, are of themselves the strongest presumption against his having founded so large a number of colonies.

of the Caspian Gates. Such establishments were really fortified posts to hold the country in subjection: Alexander lodged in them detachments from his army, but none of these detachments can well have been large, since he could not afford materially to weaken his army, while active military operations were still going on and while farther advance was in contemplation. More of these settlements were founded in Sogdiana than elsewhere; but respecting the Sogdian foundations, we know that the Greeks whom he established there, chained to the spot only by fear of his power, broke away in mutiny immediately on the news of his death[1]. Some Greek soldiers in Alexander's army on the Jaxartes or the Hydaspes, sick and weary of his interminable marches, might prefer being enrolled among the colonists of a new city on one of these unknown rivers, to the ever-repeated routine of exhausting duty[2]. But it is certain that no volunteer emigrants would go forth to settle at distances such as their imaginations could hardly conceive. The absorbing appetite of Alexander was conquest, to the East, West, South, and North; the cities which he planted were established, for the most part, as garrisons to maintain his most distant and most precarious acquisitions. The purpose of colonization was altogether subordinate; and that of hellenizing

[1] Diodor. xvii. 99; xviii. 7. Curtius, ix. 7, 1. Curtius observes (vii. 10, 15) respecting Alexander's colonies in Sogdiana—that they were founded "velut fræni domitarum gentium; nunc originis suæ oblita serviunt, quibus imperaverunt."

[2] See the plain-spoken outburst of the Thurian Antileon, one of the soldiers in Xenophon's Ten Thousand Greeks, when the army reached Trapezus (Xenoph. Anabas. v. 1, 2).

Asia, so far as we can see, was not even contemplated, much less realized.

It was not Alexander, but the Diadochi after him, who chiefly hellenized Asia.

This process of hellenizing Asia—insofar as Asia was ever hellenized—which has often been ascribed to Alexander, was in reality the work of the Diadochi who came after him; though his conquests doubtless opened the door and established the military ascendency which rendered such a work practicable. The position, the aspirations, and the interests, of these Diadochi—Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleukus, Lysimachus, &c.—were materially different from those of Alexander. They had neither appetite nor means for new and remote conquest; their great rivalry was with each other; each sought to strengthen himself near home against the rest. It became a matter of fashion and pride with them, not less than of interest, to found new cities immortalising their family names. These foundations were chiefly made in the regions of Asia near and known to Greeks, where Alexander had planted none. Thus the great and numerous foundations of Seleukus Nikator and his successors covered Syria, Mesopotamia, and parts of Asia Minor. All these regions were known to Greeks, and more or less tempting to new Grecian immigrants—not out of reach or hearing of the Olympic and other festivals, as the Jaxartes and the Indus were. In this way a considerable influx of new Hellenic blood was poured into Asia during the century succeeding Alexander,—probably in great measure from Italy and Sicily, where the condition of the Greek cities became more and more calamitous—besides the numerous Greeks who took service as individuals

under these Asiatic kings. Greeks, and Macedonians speaking Greek, became predominant, if not in numbers, at least in importance, throughout most of the cities in Western Asia. In particular, the Macedonian military organization, discipline, and administration, was maintained systematically among these Asiatic kings. In the account of the battle of Magnesia, fought by the Seleukid king Antiochus the Great against the Romans in 190 B.C., the Macedonian phalanx, constituting the main force of his Asiatic army, appears in all its completeness, just as it stood under Philip and Perseus in Macedonia itself[1].

How far Asia was ever really hellenized—the great fact was, that the Greek language became universally diffused.

When it is said however that Asia became hellenized under Alexander's successors, the phrase requires explanation. Hellenism, properly so called—the aggregate of habits, sentiments, energies, and intelligence, manifested by the Greeks during their epoch of autonomy[2]—never passed over into Asia; neither the highest qualities of the Greek mind, nor even the entire character of ordinary Greeks. This genuine Hellenism could not subsist under the overruling compression of Alexander, nor even under the less irresistible pressure of his successors.

[1] Appian, Syriac. 32.

[2] This is the sense in which I have always used the word *Hellenism*, throughout the present Work.

With Droysen, the word *Hellenismus—Das Hellenistische Staatensystem*—is applied to the state of things which followed upon Alexander's death; to the aggregate of kingdoms into which Alexander's conquests become distributed, having for their point of similarity the common use of Greek speech, a certain proportion of Greeks both as inhabitants and as officers, and a partial streak of Hellenic culture.

I cannot but think that such an employment of the word is misleading. At any rate, its sense must be constantly kept in mind, in order that it may not be confounded with *hellenism* in the stricter meaning.

Its living force, productive genius, self-organizing power, and active spirit of political communion, were stifled, and gradually died out. All that passed into Asia was a faint and partial resemblance of it, carrying the superficial marks of the original. The administration of the Greco-Asiatic kings was not Hellenic (as it has been sometimes called), but completely despotic, as that of the Persians had been before. Whoever follows their history, until the period of Roman dominion, will see that it turned upon the tastes, temper, and ability of the prince, and on the circumstances of the regal family. Viewing their government as a system, its prominent difference as compared with their Persian predecessors, consisted in their retaining the military traditions and organization of Philip and Alexander; an elaborate scheme of discipline and manœuvring, which could not be kept up without permanent official grades and a higher measure of intelligence than had ever been displayed under the Achæmenid kings, who had no military school or training whatever. Hence a great number of individual Greeks found employment in the military as well as in the civil service of these Greco-Asiatic kings. The intelligent Greek, instead of a citizen of Hellas, became the instrument of a foreign prince; the details of government were managed to a great degree by Greek officials, and always in the Greek language.

Greco-Asiatic cities.

Moreover, besides this, there was the still more important fact of the many new cities founded in Asia by the Seleukidæ and the other contemporary kings. Each of these cities had a considerable in-

fusion of Greek and Macedonian citizens, among the native Orientals located there, often brought by compulsion from neighbouring villages. In what numerical ratio these two elements of the civic population stood to each other, we cannot say. But the Greeks and Macedonians were the leading and active portion, who exercised the greatest assimilating force, gave imposing effect to the public manifestations of religion, had wider views and sympathies, dealt with the central government, and carried on that contracted measure of municipal autonomy which the city was permitted to retain. In these cities the Greek inhabitants, though debarred from political freedom, enjoyed a range of social activity suited to their tastes. In each, Greek was the language of public business and dealing; each formed a centre of attraction and commerce for an extensive neighbourhood; all together, they were the main Hellenic, or quasi-Hellenic, element in Asia under the Greco-Asiatic kings, as contrasted with the rustic villages, where native manners, and probably native speech, still continued with little modification. But the Greeks of Antioch, or Alexandria, or Seleukeia, were not like citizens of Athens or Thebes, nor even like men of Tarentum or Ephesus. While they communicated their language to Orientals, they became themselves substantially orientalized. Their feelings, judgments, and habits of action, ceased to be Hellenic. Polybius, when he visited Alexandria, looked with surprise and aversion on the Greeks there resident, though they were superior to the non-Hel-

lenic population, whom he considered worthless[1]. Greek social habits, festivals, and legends, passed with the Hellenic settlers into Asia; all becoming amalgamated and transformed so as to suit a new Asiatic abode. Important social and political consequences turned upon the diffusion of the language, and upon the establishment of such a common medium of communication throughout Western Asia. But after all, the hellenized Asiatic was not so much a Greek as a foreigner with Grecian speech, exterior varnish, and superficial manifestations; distinguished fundamentally from those Greek citizens with whom the present history has been concerned. So he would have been considered by Sophokles, by Thucydides, by Sokrates.

Increase of the means of communication between various parts of the world.

Thus much is necessary, in order to understand the bearing of Alexander's conquests, not only upon the Hellenic population, but upon Hellenic attributes and peculiarities. While crushing the Greeks as communities at home, these conquests opened a wider range to the Greeks as individuals abroad;

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 797. ὁ γοῦν Πολύβιος, γεγονὼς ἐν τῇ πόλει (Alexandria), βδελύττεται τὴν ταύτῃ κατάστασιν, &c.

The Museum of Alexandria (with its library) must be carefully distinguished from the city and the people. It was an artificial institution, which took its rise altogether from the personal taste and munificence of the earlier Ptolemies, especially the second. It was one of the noblest and most useful institutions recorded in history, and forms the most honourable monument of what Droysen calls the *hellenistic* period, between the death of Alexander and the extension of the Roman empire into Asia. But this Museum, though situated at Alexandria, had no peculiar connexion with the city or its population; it was a College of literary Fellows (if we may employ a modern word) congregated out of various Grecian towns. Eratosthenes, Kallimachus, Aristophanes, Aristarchus, were not natives of Alexandria.

and produced—perhaps the best of all their effects—a great increase of intercommunication, multiplication of roads, extension of commercial dealing, and enlarged facilities for the acquisition of geographical knowledge. There already existed in the Persian empire an easy and convenient royal road (established by Darius son of Hystaspes and described as well as admired by Herodotus) for the three months' journey between Sardis and Susa; and there must have been another regular road from Susa and Ekbatana to Baktria, Sogdiana, and India. Alexander, had he lived, would doubtless have multiplied on a still larger scale the communications both by sea and land between the various parts of his world-empire. We read that among the gigantic projects which he was contemplating when surprised by death, one was, the construction of a road all along the northern coast of Africa, as far as the Pillars of Herakles[1]. He had intended to found a new maritime city on the Persian Gulf, at the mouth of the Euphrates, and to incur much outlay for regulating the flow of water in its lower course. The river would probably have been thus made again to afford the same conveniences, both for navigation and irrigation, as it appears to have furnished in earlier times under the ancient Baby-

[1] Diodor. xviii. 4. Pausanias (ii. 1, 5) observes that Alexander wished to cut through Mount Mimas (in Asia Minor), but that this was the only one, among all his undertakings, which did not succeed. "So difficult is it (he goes on) to put force upon the divine arrangements," τὰ θεῖα βιάσασθαι· He wished to cut through the isthmus between Teos and Klazomenæ, so as to avoid the navigation round the cliffs of Mimas (σκόπελον νιφόεντα Μίμαντος—Aristophan. Nub. 274) between Chios and Erythræ. Probably this was among the projects suggested to Alexander, in the last year of his life. We have no other information about it.

Ionian kings. Orders had been also given for constructing a fleet to explore the Caspian Sea. Alexander believed that sea to be connected with the Eastern Ocean[1], and intended to make it his point of departure for circumnavigating the eastern limits of Asia, which country yet remained for him to conquer. The voyage already performed by Nearchus, from the mouth of the Indus to that of the Euphrates, was in those days a splendid maritime achievement; to which another still greater was on the point of being added—the circumnavigation of Arabia from the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea; though here we must remark, that this same voyage (from the mouth of the Indus round Arabia into the Red Sea) had been performed in thirty months, a century and a half before, by Skylax of Karyanda, under the orders of Darius son of Hystaspes[2]; yet, though recorded by Herodotus, forgotten (as it would appear) by Alexander and his contemporaries. This enlarged and systematic exploration of the earth, combined with increased means of communication among its inhabitants, is the main feature in Alexander's career which presents itself as promising real consequences beneficial to humanity.

[1] Arrian, v. 26, 2.

[2] Herodot. iv. 44: compare iii. 102. That Arrian had not present to his memory this narrative of Herodotus, is plain from the last chapter of his Indica; though in his history of Alexander he alludes several times to Herodotus. Some authors have concluded from Arrian's silence that he disbelieved the fact: if he had disbelieved it, I think that he would have mentioned the statement of Herodotus nevertheless, with an intimation that he did not think it worthy of credit. Moreover, Arrian's disbelief (even granting that such was the state of his mind) is not to be held as a conclusive disproof of the story. I confess that I see no sufficient reason for discrediting the narrative of Herodotus—though some eminent modern writers are of an oposite oppinion.

We read that Alexander felt so much interest in the extension of science, that he gave to Aristotle the immense sum of 800 talents in money, placing under his directions several thousand men, for the purpose of prosecuting zoological researches[1]. These exaggerations are probably the work of those enemies of the philosopher who decried him as a pensioner of the Macedonian court; but it is probable enough that Philip, and Alexander in the early part of his reign, may have helped Aristotle in the difficult process of getting together facts and specimens for observation—from esteem towards him personally, rather than from interest in his discoveries. The intellectual turn of Alexander was towards literature, poetry, and history. He was fond of the Iliad especially, as well as of the Attic tragedians; so that Harpalus, being directed to send some books to him in Upper Asia, selected as the most acceptable packet various tragedies of Æschylus, Sophokles, and Euripides, with the dithyrambic poems of Telestes and the histories of Phlistus[2].

Interest of Alexander in science and literature—not great.

[1] Pliny, H. N. viii. 17; Athenæus, ix. p. 398. See Schneider's Preface to his edition of Aristotle's Historiæ De Animalibus, p. xxxix *seq.*

[2] Plutarch, Alexand. 8.

CHAPTER XCV.

GRECIAN AFFAIRS FROM THE LANDING OF ALEXANDER IN ASIA TO THE CLOSE OF THE LAMIAN WAR.

State of the Grecian world when Alexander crossed the Hellespont.

EVEN in 334 B.C., when Alexander first entered upon his Asiatic campaigns, the Grecian cities, great as well as small, had been robbed of all their free agency, and existed only as appendages of the kingdom of Macedonia. Several of them were occupied by Macedonian garrisons, or governed by local despots who leaned upon such armed force for support. There existed among them no common idea or public sentiment, formally proclaimed and acted on, except such as it suited Alexander's purpose to encourage. The miso-Persian sentiment—once a genuine expression of Hellenic patriotism, to the recollection of which Demosthenes was wont to appeal, in animating the Athenians to action against Macedonia, but now extinct and supplanted by nearer apprehensions—had been converted by Alexander to his own purposes, as a pretext for headship, and a help for ensuring submission during his absence in Asia. Greece had become a province of Macedonia; the affairs of the Greeks (observes Aristotle in illustrating a philosophical discussion) are "in the hands of the king[1]". A public synod of the Greeks sat from time to time at Corinth; but it represented only philo-Macedonian

[1] Aristot. Physic. iv. 3. p. 210 a. 21. ἔτι ὡς ἐν βασιλεῖ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ὅλως ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ κινητικῷ.

sentiment; all that we know of its proceedings consisted in congratulations to Alexander on his victories. There is no Grecian history of public or political import; there are no facts except the local and municipal details of each city—"the streets and fountains which we are repairing, and the battlements which we are whitening," to use a phrase of Demosthenes[1]—the good management of the Athenian finances by the orator Lykurgus, and the contentions of orators respecting private disputes or politics of the past.

Grecian spirit might have been called into action, if the Persians had played their game well.

But though Grecian history is thus stagnant and suspended during the first years of Alexander's Asiatic campaigns, it might at any moment have become animated with an active spirit of self-emancipation, if he had experienced reverses, or if the Persians had administered their own affairs with skill and vigour. I have already stated, that during the first two years of the war, the Persian fleet (we ought rather to say, the Phenician fleet in the Persian service) had a decided superiority at sea. Darius possessed untold treasures which might have indefinitely increased that superiority and multiplied his means of transmarine action, had he chosen to follow the advice of Memnon, by acting vigorously from the sea and strictly on the defensive by land. The movement or quiescence of the Greeks therefore depended on the turn of affairs in Asia; as Alexander himself was well aware.

During the winter of 334-333 B.C., Memnon with the Persian fleet appeared to be making progress among the islands in the Ægean[2], and the

[1] Demosthen. Olynthiac. iii. p. 36.

[2] Arrian, ii. 1.

Hopes raised in Greece, first by the Persian fleet in the Ægean, next by the two great Persian armies on land.

anti-Macedonian Greeks were expecting him farther westward in Eubœa and Peloponnesus. Their hopes being dashed by his unexpected death, and still more by Darius's abandonment of the Memnonian plans, they had next to wait for the chance of what might be achieved by the immense Persian land-force. Even down to the eve of the battle of Issus, Demosthenes[1] and others (as has already been mentioned) were encouraged by their correspondents in Asia to anticipate success for Darius even in pitched battle. But after the great disaster at Issus, during a year and a half (from November 333 B.C. to March or April 331 B.C.), no hope was possible. The Persian force seemed extinct, and Darius was so paralysed by the captivity of his family, that he suffered even the citizens of Tyre and Gaza to perish in their gallant efforts of defence, without the least effort to save them. At length, in the spring of 331 B.C., the prospects again appeared to improve. A second Persian army, countless like the first, was assembling eastward of the Tigris; Alexander advanced into the interior, many weeks' march from the shores of the Mediterranean, to attack them; and the Persians doubtless transmitted encouragements with money to enterprising men in Greece, in hopes of provoking auxiliary movements. Presently (October 331 B.C.) came the catastrophe at Arbela; after which no demonstration against Alexander could have been attempted with any reasonable hope of success.

Such was the varying point of view under which the contest in Asia presented itself to Grecian spec-

[1] Æschines cont. Ktesiph. p. 552.

tators, during the three years and a half between the landing of Alexander in Asia and the battle of Arbela. As to the leading states in Greece, we have to look at Athens and Sparta only; for Thebes had been destroyed and demolished as a city; and what had been once the citadel of the Kadmeia was now a Macedonian garrison[1]. Moreover, besides that garrison, the Bœotian cities, Orchomenus, Platæa, &c., were themselves strongholds of Macedonian dependence; being hostile to Thebes of old, and having received among themselves assignments of all the Theban lands[2]. In case of any movement in Greece, therefore, Antipater, the viceroy of Macedonia, might fairly count on finding in Greece interested allies, serving as no mean check upon Attica.

Public acts and policy at Athens—decidedly pacific.

At Athens, the reigning sentiment was decidedly pacific. Few were disposed to brave the prince who had just given so fearful an evidence of his force by the destruction of Thebes and the enslavement of the Thebans. Ephialtes and Charidemus, the military citizens at Athens most anti-Macedonian in sentiment, had been demanded as prisoners by Alexander, and had withdrawn to Asia, there to take service with Darius. Other Athenians, men of energy and action, had followed their example, and had fought against Alexander at the Granikus, where they became his prisoners, and were sent to Macedonia to work in fetters at the mines. Ephialtes perished at the siege of Halikarnassus, while

[1] Vita Demosthenis ap. Westermann, Scriptt. Biograph. p. 301. φρουρὰν καταστήσαντος Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις μετὰ τὸ κατασκάψαι τοὺς Θηβαίους, &c.

[2] Pausanias, i. 25, 4.

defending the place with the utmost gallantry; Charidemus suffered a more unworthy death from the shameful sentence of Darius. The anti-Macedonian leaders who remained at Athens, such as Demosthenes and Lykurgus, were not generals or men of action, but statesmen and orators. They were fully aware that submission to Alexander was a painful necessity, though they watched not the less anxiously for any reverse which might happen to him, such as to make it possible for Athens to head a new struggle on behalf of Grecian freedom.

Phokion and Demades were leading ministers at Athens—they were of macedonizing politics.

But it was not Demosthenes or Lykurgus who now guided the general policy of Athens[1]. For the twelve years between the destruction of Thebes and the death of Alexander, Phokion and Demades were her ministers for foreign affairs; two men of totally opposite characters, but coinciding in pacific views, and in looking to the favour of Alexander and Antipater as the principal end to be attained. Twenty Athenian triremes were sent to act with the Macedonian fleet, during Alexander's first campaign in Asia; these, together with the Athenian prisoners taken at the Granikus, served to him farther as a guarantee for the continued submission of the Athenians generally[2]. There can be no doubt that the pacific policy of Phokion was now prudent and essential to Athens, though the same cannot be said (as I have remarked in the proper

[1] "Since Macedonian dominion became paramount (observes Demosthenes, De Coronâ, p. 331), Æschines and men of his stamp are in full ascendency and affluence—I am impotent: there is no place at Athens for free citizens and counsellors, but only for men who do what they are ordered, and flatter the ruling potentate."

[2] Arrian, i. 29, 8.

place) for his advocacy of the like policy twenty years before, when Philip's power was growing and might have been arrested by vigorous opposition. It suited the purpose of Antipater to ensure his hold upon Athens by frequent presents to Demades, a man of luxurious and extravagant habits. But Phokion, incorruptible as well as poor to the end, declined all similar offers, though often made to him, not only by Antipater, but even by Alexander[1].

Demosthenes and Lykurgus, though not in the ascendent politically, are nevertheless still public men of importance. Financial activity of Lykurgus.

It deserves particular notice, that though the macedonising policy was now decidedly in the ascendent—accepted, even by dissentients, as the only course admissible under the circumstances, and confirmed the more by each successive victory of Alexander—yet statesmen, like Lykurgus and Demosthenes, of notorious anti-Macedonian sentiment, still held a conspicuous and influential position, though of course restricted to matters of internal administration. Thus Lykurgus continued to be the real acting minister of finance, for three successive Panathenaic intervals of four years each, or for an uninterrupted period of twelve years. He superintended not merely the entire collection, but also the entire disbursement of the public revenue; rendering strict periodical account, yet with a financial authority greater than had belonged to any statesman since Perikles. He improved the gymnasia and stadia of the city—multiplied the donatives and sacred furniture in the temples,—enlarged, or constructed anew, docks and arsenals,—provided a considerable stock of arms

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 30.

and equipments, military as well as naval—and maintained four hundred triremes in a seaworthy condition, for the protection of Athenian commerce. In these extensive functions he was never superseded, though Alexander at one time sent to require the surrender of his person, which was refused by the Athenian people[1]. The main cause of his firm hold upon the public mind, was, his known and indisputable pecuniary probity, wherein he was the parallel of Phokion.

Position of Demosthenes—his prudent conduct.

As to Demosthenes, he did not hold any such commanding public appointments as Lykurgus; but he enjoyed great esteem and sympathy from the people generally, for his marked line of public counsel during the past. The proof of this is to be found in one very significant fact. The indictment, against Ktesiphon's motion for crowning Demosthenes, was instituted by Æschines, and official entry made of it, before the death of Philip—which event occurred

[1] See the remarkable decree in honour of Lykurgus, passed by the Athenian people seventeen or eighteen years after his death, in the archonship of Anaxikrates, B.C. 307 (Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 852). The reciting portion of this decree, constituting four-fifths of the whole, goes over the public conduct of Lykurgus, and is very valuable.

It seems that the twelve years of financial administration exercised by Lykurgus, are to be taken probably, either from 342-330 B.C.—or four years later, from 338-326 B.C. Boeckh leaves the point undetermined between the two. Droysen and Meier prefer the earlier period—O. Müller the later. (Boeckh, Urkunden über das Attische Seewesen, also the second edition of his Staats-haushaltung der Athener, vol. ii. p. 114-118.)

The total of public money, recorded by the Inscription as having passed through the hands of Lykurgus in the twelve years, was 18,900 talents = £4,340,000, or thereabouts. He is said to have held, besides, in deposit, a great deal of money entrusted to him by private individuals. His official duties as treasurer were discharged, for the first four years, in his own name; during the last eight years, in the names of two different friends.

in August 336 B.C. Yet Æschines did not venture to bring it on for trial until August 330 B.C., after Antipater had subdued the ill-fated rising of the Lacedæmonian king Agis; and even at that advantageous moment, when the macedonisers seemed in full triumph, he signally failed. We thus perceive, that though Phokion and Demadês were now the leaders of Athenian affairs, as representing a policy which every one felt to be unavoidable—yet the preponderant sentiment of the people went with Demosthenes and Lykurgus. In fact, we shall see that after the Lamian war, Antipater thought it requisite to subdue or punish this sentiment by disfranchising or deporting two-thirds of the citizens[1]. It seems however that the anti-Macedonian statesmen were very cautious of giving offence to Alexander, between 334 and 330 B.C. Ktesiphon accepted a mission of condolence to Kleopatra, sister of Alexander, on the death of her husband Alexander of Epirus; and Demosthenes stands accused of having sent humble and crouching letters to Alexander (the Great) in Phenicia, during the spring of 331 B.C. This assertion of Æschines, though not to be trusted as correct, indicates the general prudence of Demosthenes as to his known and formidable enemy[2].

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 28.

[2] Æschines (adv. Ktesiph. p. 635) mentions this mission of Ktesiphon to Kleopatra. He also (in the same oration, p. 550) charges Demosthenes with having sent letters to Alexander, soliciting pardon and favour. He states that a young man named Aristion, a friend of Demosthenes, was much about the person of Alexander, and that through him the letters were sent. He cites as his authority the seamen of the public Athenian vessel called *Paralus*, and the Athenian envoys who went to Alexander in Phenicia in the spring or summer of 331 B.C. (compare Arrian, iii. 6, 3). Hyperides also seems to have advanced

Anti-Macedonian movement from Sparta—King Agis visits the Persian admirals in the Ægean. His attempts both in Krete and in Peloponnesus.

It was not from Athens, but from Sparta, that anti-Macedonian movements now took rise.

In the decisive battle unsuccessfully fought by Athens and Thebes at Chæroneia against Philip, the Spartans had not been concerned. Their king Archidamus,—who had been active conjointly with Athens in the Sacred War, trying to uphold the Phokians against Philip and the Thebans,—had afterwards withdrawn himself from Central Greece to assist the Tarentines in Italy, and had been slain in a battle against the Messapians[1]. He was succeeded by his son Agis, a brave and enterprising man, under whom the Spartans, though abstaining from hostilities against Philip, resolutely declined to take part in the synod at Corinth, whereby the Macedonian prince was nominated Leader of the Greeks; and even persisted in the same denial on Alexander's nomination also. When Alexander sent to Athens three hundred panoplies after his victory at the Granikus, to be dedicated in the temple of Athênê, he expressly proclaimed in the inscription, that they were dedicated "by Alexander and the Greeks, *excepting the Lacedæmonians*[2]." Agis took the lead

the like allegation against Demosthenes—see Harpokration, v. Ἀριστίων.

The fragments of the oration of Hyperides in defence of Euxenippus (recently published by Mr. Churchill Babington), delivered at some period during the reign of Alexander, give general evidence of the widespread feeling of jealous aversion to the existing Macedonian ascendency. Euxenippus had been accused of devotion to Macedonia; Hyperides strenuously denies it, saying that Euxenippus had never been in Macedonia, nor ever conversed with any Macedonian who came to Athens. Even boys at school (says Hyperides) know the names of the corrupt orators, or servile flatterers, who serve Macedonia—Euxenippus is not among them (p. 11, 12).

[1] Plutarch, Camill. 19; Diodor. xvi. 88; Plutarch, Agis, 3.

[2] Arrian, i. 16, 11: compare Pausan. vii. 10, 1.

in trying to procure Persian aid for anti-Macedonian operations in Greece. Towards the close of summer 333 B.C., a little before the battle of Issus, he visited the Persian admirals at Chios, to solicit men and money for intended action in Peloponnesus[1]. At that moment, they were not zealous in the direction of Greece, anticipating (as most Asiatics then did) the complete destruction of Alexander in Kilikia. As soon, however, as the disaster of Issus became known, they placed at the disposal of Agis thirty talents and ten triremes; which he employed, under his brother Agesilaus, in making himself master of Krete—feeling that no movement in Greece could be expected at such a discouraging crisis. Agis himself soon afterwards went to that island, having strengthened himself by a division of the Greek mercenaries who had fought under Darius at Issus. In Krete, he appears to have had considerable temporary success; and even in Peloponnesus, he organized some demonstrations, which Alexander sent Amphoterus with a large naval force to repress, in the spring of 331 B.C.[2]. At that time, Phenicia, Egypt, and all the naval mastery of the Ægean, had passed into the hands of the conqueror, so that the Persians had no direct means of acting upon Greece. Probably Amphoterus recovered Krete, but he had no land-force to attack Agis in Peloponnesus.

[1] Arrian, ii. 13, 4.

[2] Arrian, iii. 6, 4; Diodor. xvii. 48; Curtius, iv. 1, 39. It is to this war in Krete, between Agis and the Macedonian party and troops, that Aristotle probably alludes (in the few words contained, Politica, ii. 7, 8), as having exposed the weakness of the Kretan institutions—see Schneider's note on the passage. At least we do not know of any other event, suitable to the words.

B.C. 330, spring. Agis levies an army in Peloponnesus, and makes open declaration against Antipater.

In October 331 B.C., Darius was beaten at Arbela and became a fugitive in Media, leaving Babylon, Susa, and Persepolis, with the bulk of his immense treasures, as a prey to the conqueror during the coming winter. After such prodigious accessions to Alexander's force, it would seem that any anti-Macedonian movement, during the spring of 330 B.C., must have been obviously hopeless and even insane. Yet it was just then that King Agis found means to enlarge his scale of operations in Peloponnesus, and prevailed on a considerable body of new allies to join him. As to himself personally, he and the Lacedæmonians had been previously in a state of proclaimed war with Macedonia[1], and therefore incurred little additional risk; moreover,

[1] Alexander, as soon as he got possession of the Persian treasures at Susa (about December 331 B.C.), sent a large remittance of 3000 talents to Antipater, as means for carrying on the war against the Lacedæmonians (Arrian, iii. 16, 17). The manifestations of Agis in Peloponnesus had begun in the spring of 331 B.C. (Arrian, iii. 6, 4); but his aggressive movements in Peloponnesus did not assume formidable proportions until the spring of 330 B.C. . At the date of the speech of Æschines against Ktesiphon (August 330 B.C.), the decisive battle by which Antipater crushed the forces of Agis had only recently occurred; for the Lacedæmonian prisoners were only *about to be sent* to Alexander to learn their fate (Æsch. adv. Kt. p. 524). Curtius (vii. 1, 21) is certainly mistaken in saying that the contest was terminated before the battle of Arbela. Moreover, there were Lacedæmonian envoys, present with Darius until a few days before his death (July 330 B.C.), who afterwards fell into the hands of Alexander (Arrian, iii. 24, 7); these men could hardly have known of the prostration of their country at home. I suppose the victory of Antipater to have taken place about June 330 B.C.—and the Peloponnesian armament of Agis to have been got together about three months before (March 330 B.C.).

Mr. Clinton (Fast. II. App. c. 4, p. 234) discusses the chronology of this event, but in a manner which I cannot think satisfactory. He seems inclined to put it some months earlier. I see no necessity for construing the dictum ascribed to Alexander (Plutarch, Agesilaus, 15) as proving close coincidence of time between the battle of Arbela and the final defeat of Agis.

it was one of the effects of the Asiatic disasters to cast back upon Greece small bands of soldiers who had hitherto found service in the Persian armies. These men willingly came to Cape Tænarus to enlist under a warlike king of Sparta; so that Agis found himself at the head of a force which appeared considerable to Peloponnesians, familiar only with the narrow scale of Grecian war-muster, though insignificant as against Alexander or his viceroy in Macedonia[1]. An unexpected ray of hope broke out from the revolt of Memnon, the Macedonian governor of Thrace. Antipater was thus compelled to withdraw some of his forces to a considerable distance from Greece; while Alexander, victorious as he was, being in Persis or Media, east of Mount Zagros, appeared in the eyes of a Greek to have reached the utmost limits of the habitable world[2]. Of this partial encouragement Agis took advantage, to march out of Lakonia with all the troops, mercenary and native, that he could muster. He called on the Peloponnesians for a last effort against Macedonian dominion, while Darius still retained all the eastern half of his empire, and while support from him in men and money might yet be anticipated[3].

Respecting this war, we know very few details. B.C. 330. At first, a flush of success appeared to attend Agis. The Eleians, the Achæans (except Pellênê), the

[1] Alexander in Media, when informed of the whole affair after the death of Agis, spoke of it with contempt as a battle of frogs and mice, if we are to believe the dictum of Plutarch, Agesilaus, 15.

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiphont. p. 553. ὁ δ' Ἀλέξανδρος ἔξω τῆς ἄρκτου καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀλίγου δεῖν πάσης μεθειστήκει, &c.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 62; Deinarchus cont. Demosthen. s. 35.

Agis, at first partially successful, is completely defeated by Antipater, and slain.

Arcadians (except Megalopolis) and some other Peloponnesians, joined his standard; so that he was enabled to collect an army stated at 20,000 foot and 2000 horse. Defeating the first Macedonian forces sent against him, he proceeded to lay siege to Megalopolis; which city, now as previously, was the stronghold of Macedonian influence in the peninsula, and was probably occupied by a Macedonian garrison. An impulse manifested itself at Athens in favour of active sympathy, and equipment of a fleet to aid this anti-Macedonian effort. It was resisted by Phokion and Demades, doubtless upon all views of prudence, but especially upon one financial ground, taken by the latter, that the people would be compelled to forego the Theoric distribution[1]. Even Demosthenes himself, under circumstances so obviously discouraging, could not recommend the formidable step of declaring against Alexander—though he seems to have indulged in the expression of general anti-Macedonian sympathies, and to have complained of the helplessness into which Athens had been brought by past bad policy[2]. Antipater, closing the war in Thrace on the best terms that he could, hastened into Greece

[1] Plutarch, Reipubl. Gerend. Præcept. p. 818.

[2] This is what we make out, as to the conduct of Demosthenes, from Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 553.

It is however difficult to believe, what Æschines insinuates, that Demosthenes boasted of having himself got up the Lacedæmonian movement—and yet that he made no proposition or suggestion for countenancing it. Demosthenes can hardly have lent any positive aid to the proceeding, though of course his anti-Macedonian feelings would be counted upon, in case things took a favourable turn.

Deinarchus (*ut suprà*) also accuses Demosthenes of having remained inactive at this critical moment.

with his full forces, and reached Peloponnesus in time to relieve Megalopolis, which had begun to be in danger. One decisive battle, which took place in Arcadia, sufficed to terminate the war. Agis and his army, the Lacedæmonians especially, fought with gallantry and desperation, but were completely defeated. Five thousand of their men were slain, including Agis himself; who, though covered with wounds, disdained to leave the field, and fell resisting to the last. The victors, according to one account, lost 3500 men; according to another, 1000 slain, together with a great many wounded. This was a greater loss than Alexander had sustained either at Issus or at Arbela; a plain proof, that Agis and his companions, however unfortunate in the result, had manifested courage worthy of the best days of Sparta.

Complete submission of all Greece to Antipater —Spartan envoys sent up to Alexander in Asia.

The allied forces were now so completely crushed, that all submitted to Antipater. After consulting the philo-Macedonian synod at Corinth, he condemned the Achæans and Eleians to pay 120 talents to Megalopolis, and exacted from the Tegeans the punishment of those among their leading men who had advised the war[1]. But he would not take upon him to determine the treatment of the Lacedæmonians, without special reference to Alexander. Requiring from them fifty hostages, he sent up to Alexander in Asia some Lacedæmonian envoys or prisoners, to throw themselves on his mercy[2]. We are

[1] Curtius, vi. 1, 15–20; Diodor. xvii. 63–73. After the defeat, a suspensive decree was passed by the Spartans, releasing from ἀτιμία those who had escaped from the battle—as had been done after Leuktra (Diodor. xix. 70).

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 524.

told, that they did not reach the king until a long time afterwards, at Baktra[1]; what he decided about Sparta generally, we do not know.

Untoward result of the defensive efforts of Greece —want of combination.

The rising of the Thebans, not many months after Alexander's accession, had been the first attempt of the Greeks to emancipate themselves from Macedonian dominion; this enterprise of Agis was the second. Both unfortunately had been partial, without the possibility of any extensive or organized combination beforehand; both ended miserably, riveting the chains of Greece more powerfully than ever. Thus was the self-defensive force of Greece extinguished piecemeal. The scheme of Agis was in fact desperate from the very outset, as against the gigantic power of Alexander; and would perhaps never have been undertaken, had not Agis himself been already compromised in hostility against Macedonia, before the destruction of the Persian force at Issus. This unfortunate prince, without any superior ability (so far as we know), manifested a devoted courage and patriotism worthy of his predecessor Leonidas at Thermopylæ; whose renown stands higher, only because the cause in which he fell ultimately triumphed. The Athenians and Ætolians, neither of whom took part with Agis, were now left, without Thebes and Sparta, as the two great military powers of Greece; which will appear presently, when we come to the last struggle for Grecian independence—the Lamian war; better combined and more promising, yet not less disastrous in its result.

B.C. 330. Though the strongest considerations of prudence

[1] Curtius, vii. 4, 32.

kept Athens quiet during this anti-Macedonian movement in Peloponnesus, a powerful sympathy must have been raised among her citizens while the struggle was going on. Had Agis gained the victory over Antipater, the Athenians might probably have declared in his favour; and although no independent position could have been permanently maintained against so overwhelming an enemy as Alexander, yet considering that he was thoroughly occupied and far in the interior of Asia, Greece might have held out against Antipater for an interval not inconsiderable. In the face of such eventualities, the fears of the macedonising statesmen now in power at Athens, the hopes of their opponents, and the reciprocal antipathies of both, must have become unusually manifest; so that the reaction afterwards, when the Macedonian power became more irresistible than ever, was considered by the enemies of Demosthenes to offer a favourable opportunity for ruining and dishonouring him.

Position of parties at Athens during the struggle of Agis—reaction of the macedonising party after his defeat.

To the political peculiarity of this juncture we owe the judicial contest between the two great Athenian orators; the memorable accusation of Æschines against Ktesiphon, for having proposed a crown to Demosthenes—and the still more memorable defence of Demosthenes, on behalf of his friend as well as of himself. It was in the autumn or winter of 337–336 B.C., that Ktesiphon had proposed this vote of public honour in favour of Demosthenes, and had obtained the probouleuma or preliminary acquiescence of the senate; it was in the same Attic year, and not long afterwards, that Æschines attacked the proposition under the

Judicial contest between Æschines and Demosthenes. Preliminary circumstances as to the proposition of Ktesiphon, and the indictment by Æschines.

Graphê Paranomôn, as illegal, unconstitutional, mischievous, and founded on false allegations[1]. More than six years had thus elapsed since the formal entry of the accusation; yet Æschines had not chosen to bring it to actual trial; which indeed could not be done without some risk to himself, before the numerous and popular judicature of Athens. Twice or thrice before his accusation was entered, other persons had moved to confer the same honour upon Demosthenes[2], and had been

[1] Among the various documents, real or pretended, inserted in the oration of Demosthenes De Coronâ, there appears one (p. 266) purporting to be the very decree moved by Ktesiphon; and another (p. 243) purporting to be the accusation preferred by Æschines. I have already stated that I agree with Droysen in mistrusting all the documents annexed to this oration; all of them bear the name of wrong archons, most of them names of unknown archons; some of them do not fit the place in which they appear. See my preceding Vol. XI. Ch. lxxxix. p. 585; Ch. xc. p. 630–673.

We know from the statement of Æschines himself that the motion of Ktesiphon was made after the appointment of Demosthenes to be one of the inspectors of the fortifications of the city; and that this appointment took place in the last month of the archon Chærondas (June 337 B.C.—see Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 421–426). We also know that the accusation of Æschines against Ktesiphon was preferred before the assassination of Philip, which took place in August 336 B.C. (Æschin. ib. p. 612, 613). It thus appears that the motion of Ktesiphon (with the probouleuma which followed upon it) must have occurred some time during the autumn or winter of 337–336 B.C.—that the accusation of Æschines must have been handed in shortly after it—and that this accusation cannot have been handed in at the date borne by the pseudo-document, p. 243—the month Elaphebolion of the archon Chærondas, which would be anterior to the appointment of Demosthenes. Moreover, whoever compares the so-called motion of Ktesiphon, as it stands inserted Demosth. De Coronâ, p. 266, with the words in which Æschines himself (adv. Ktesiph. p. 631. *ὅθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ψηφίσματος ἐποιήσω*, see also p. 439) describes the exordium of that motion, will see that it cannot be genuine.

[2] Demosthenes De Coronâ, p. 253, 302, 303, 310. He says (p. 267–313) that he had been crowned *often* (*πολλάκις*) by the Athenians and other Greek cities. The crown which he received on the motion of

indicted under the Graphê Paranomôn; but with such signal ill success, that their accusers did not obtain so much as one-fifth of the suffrages of the Dikasts, and therefore incurred (under the standing regulation of Attic law) a penalty of 1000 drachmæ. The like danger awaited Æschines; and although, in reference to the illegality of Ktesiphon's motion (which was the direct and ostensible purpose aimed at under the Graphê Paranomôn), his indictment was grounded on special circumstances such as the previous accusers may not have been able to show, still it was not his real object to confine himself within this narrow and technical argument. He intended to enlarge the range of accusation, so as to include the whole character and policy of Demosthenes; who would thus, if the verdict went against him, stand publicly dishonoured both as citizen and as politician. Unless this latter purpose were accomplished, indeed, Æschines gained nothing by bringing the indictment into court; for the mere entry of the indictment would have already produced the effect of preventing the probouleuma from passing into a decree, and the crown from being actually conferred. Doubtless Ktesiphon and Demosthenes might have forced Æschines to the alternative of either dropping his indictment or bringing it into the Dikastery. But this was a forward challenge, which, in reference to a purely honorary vote, they had not felt bold enough to send; especially after the capture of Thebes in

Aristonikus (after the successes against Philip at Byzantium and the Chersonesus, &c. in 340 B.C.) was the *second* crown (p. 253)—Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 848.

335 B.C., when the victorious Alexander demanded the surrender of Demosthenes with several other citizens.

Accusatory harangue of Æschines, nominally against the proposition of Ktesiphon, really against the political life of Demosthenes.

In this state of abeyance and compromise—Demosthenes enjoying the inchoate honour of a complimentary vote from the senate, Æschines intercepting it from being matured into a vote of the people—both the vote and the indictment had remained for rather more than six years. But the accuser now felt encouraged to push his indictment to trial, under the reactionary party feeling, following on abortive anti-Macedonian hopes, which succeeded to the complete victory of Antipater over Agis, and which brought about the accusation of anti-Macedonian citizens in Naxos, Thasos, and other Grecian cities also[1]. Amidst the fears prevalent that the victor would carry his resentment still farther, Æschines could now urge that Athens was disgraced by having adopted or even approved the policy of Demosthenes[2], and that an emphatic condemnation of him was the only way of clearing her from the charge of privity with those who had raised the standard against Macedonian supremacy. In an able and bitter harangue, Æschines

[1] Demosthenes De Coronâ, p. 294.

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 645. *διαβέβληται δ' ἡμῶν ἡ πόλις ἐκ τῶν Δημοσθένους πολιτευμάτων περὶ τοὺς νῦν καιρούς· δόξετε δ' ἐὰν μὲν τοῦτον στεφανώσητε, ὁμογνώμονες εἶναι τοῖς παραβαίνουσι τὴν κοινὴν εἰρήνην· ἐὰν δὲ τοὐναντίον τούτου πράξητε, ἀπολύσετε τὸν δῆμον τῶν αἰτιῶν.*—Compare with this, the last sentence of the oration of Demosthenes in reply, where he puts up a prayer to the Gods—*ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαλλαγὴν τῶν ἐπηρτημένων φόβων δότε καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀσφαλῆ.*

The mention by Æschines (immediately before) of the Pythian games, as about to be celebrated in a few days, marks the date of this judicial trial—August 330 B.C.

first shows that the motion of Ktesiphon was illegal, in consequence of the public official appointments held by Demosthenes at the moment when it was proposed—next he enters at large into the whole life and character of Demosthenes, to prove him unworthy of such an honour, even if there had been no formal grounds of objection. He distributes the entire life of Demosthenes into four periods, the first ending at the peace of 346 B.C. between Philip and the Athenians—the second, ending with the breaking out of the next ensuing war in 341-340 B.C.—the third, ending with the disaster at Chæroneia—the fourth, comprising all the time following[1]. Throughout all the four periods, he denounces the conduct of Demosthenes as having been corrupt, treacherous, cowardly, and ruinous to the city. What is more surprising still—he expressly charges him with gross subservience both to Philip and to Alexander, at the very time when he was taking credit for a patriotic and intrepid opposition to them[2]

That Athens had undergone sad defeat and humiliation, having been driven from her independent and even presidential position into the degraded character of a subject Macedonian city, since the time when Demosthenes first began political life—was a fact but too indisputable. Æschines even makes this a part of his case; arraigning the traitorous mismanagement of Demosthenes as the cause of so melancholy a revolution, and denouncing him as candidate for public compliment on no better plea

[1] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 443.

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. pp. 449, 456, 467, 551.

than a series of public calamities[1]. Having thus animadverted on the conduct of Demosthenes prior to the battle of Chæroneia, Æschines proceeds to the more recent past, and contends that Demosthenes cannot be sincere in his pretended enmity to Alexander, because he has let slip three successive occasions, all highly favourable, for instigating Athens to hostility against the Macedonians. Of these three occasions, the first was, when Alexander first crossed into Asia; the second, immediately before the battle of Issus; the third, during the flush of success obtained by Agis in Peloponnesus[2]. On neither of these occasions did Demosthenes call for any public action against Macedonia; a proof (according to Æschines) that his anti-Macedonian professions were insincere.

Appreciation of Æschines, on independent evidence, as an accuser of Demosthenes.

I have more than once remarked, that considering the bitter enmity between the two orators, it is rarely safe to trust the unsupported allegation of either against the other. But in regard to the last-mentioned charges advanced by Æschines, there is enough of known fact, and we have independent evidence, such as is not often before us, to appreciate him as an accuser of Demosthenes. The victorious career of Alexander, set forth in the preceding chapters, proves amply that not one of the three periods, here indicated by Æschines, presented even decent encouragement for a reasonable Athenian patriot, to involve his country in warfare against so formidable an enemy. Nothing can be more frivolous than these charges against Demo-

[1] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. pp. 526, 538, 541.
[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 551–553.

sthenes, of having omitted promising seasons for anti-Macedonian operations. Partly for this reason, probably, Demosthenes does not notice them in his reply; still more, perhaps, on another ground, that it was not safe to speak out what he thought and felt about Alexander. His reply dwells altogether upon the period before the death of Philip. Of the boundless empire subsequently acquired, by the son of Philip, he speaks only to mourn it as a wretched visitation of fortune, which has desolated alike the Hellenic and the barbaric world—in which Athens has been engulphed along with others—and from which even those faithless and trimming Greeks, who helped to aggrandise Philip, have not escaped better than Athens, nor indeed so well[1].

Reply of Demosthenes—oration De Coronâ.

I shall not here touch upon the Demosthenic speech De Coronâ in a rhetorical point of view, nor add anything to those encomiums which have been pronounced upon it with one voice, both in ancient and in modern times, as the unapproachable masterpiece of Grecian oratory. To this work it belongs as a portion of Grecian history; a retrospect of the efforts made by a patriot and a statesman to uphold the dignity of Athens and the autonomy of the Grecian world, against a dangerous aggressor from without. How these efforts were directed, and how they lamentably failed, has been recounted in my last preceding volume. Demosthenes here passes them in review, replying to the criminations against his public conduct during the interval of ten years, between the peace of 346 B.C. (or the period imme-

[1] Demosthen. De Coronâ, p. 311–316.

diately preceding it) and the death of Philip. It is remarkable, that though professing to enter upon a defence of his whole public life[1], he nevertheless can afford to leave unnoticed that portion of it which is perhaps the most honourable to him—the early period of his first Philippics and Olynthiacs—when, though a politician as yet immature and of no established footing, he was the first to descry in the distance the perils threatened by Philip's aggrandisement, and the loudest in calling for timely and energetic precautions against it; in spite of apathy and murmurs from older politicians as well as from the general public. Beginning with the peace of 346 B.C., Demosthenes vindicates his own share in the antecedents of that event against the charges of Æschines, whom he denounces as the cause of all the mischief; a controversy which I have already tried to elucidate, in my last volume. Passing next to the period after that peace—to the four years first of hostile diplomacy, then of hostile action, against Philip, which ended with the disaster of Chæroneia—Demosthenes is not satisfied with simple vindication. He reasserts this policy as matter of pride and honour, in spite of its results. He congratulates his countrymen on having manifested a Panhellenic patriotism worthy of their forefathers, and takes to himself only the credit of having been forward to proclaim and carry out this glorious sentiment common to all. Fortune has been adverse; yet the vigorous anti-Macedonian policy was no

[1] Demosthen. De Coronâ, p. 227. μέλλων τοῦ τε ἰδίου βίου παντὸς, ὡς ἔοικε, λόγον διδόναι τήμερον καὶ τῶν κοινῇ πεπολιτευμένων, &c.

mistake; Demosthenes swears it by the combatants of Marathon, Platæa and Salamis[1]. To have had a foreign dominion obtruded upon Greece, is an overwhelming calamity; but to have had this accomplished without strenuous resistance on the part of Athens, would have been calamity aggravated by dishonour.

Funeral oration of extinct Grecian freedom.

Conceived in this sublime strain, the reply of Demosthenes to his rival has an historical value, as a funeral oration of extinct Athenian and Grecian freedom. Six years before, the orator had been appointed by his countrymen to deliver the usual public oration over the warriors slain at Chæroneia. That speech is now lost, but it probably touched upon the same topics. Though the sphere of action, of every Greek city as well as of every Greek citizen, was now cramped and confined by irresistible Macedonian force; there still remained the sentiment of full political freedom and dignity enjoyed during the past—the admiration of ancestors who had once defended it successfully—and the sympathy with leaders who had recently stood forward to uphold it, however unsuccessfully. It is among the most memorable facts in Grecian history, that in spite of the victory of Philip at Chæroneia—in spite of the subsequent conquest of Thebes by Alexander, and the danger of Athens after it—in spite of the Asiatic conquests which had since thrown all Persian force into the hands of the

[1] Demosthen. De Coronâ, p. 297. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἡμάρτετε, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἐλευθερίας καὶ σωτηρίας κίνδυνον ἀράμενοι—οὐ μὰ τοὺς Μαραθῶνι προκινδυνεύσαντας τῶν προγόνων καὶ τοὺς ἐν Πλαταιαῖς παραταξαμένους καὶ τοὺς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχήσαντας, &c., the oath so often cited and admired.

Macedonian king—the Athenian people could never be persuaded either to repudiate Demosthenes, or to disclaim sympathy with his political policy. How much art and ability was employed, to induce them to do so, by his numerous enemies, the speech of Æschines is enough to teach us. And when we consider how easily the public sicken of schemes which end in misfortune—how great a mental relief is usually obtained by throwing blame on unsuccessful leaders—it would have been no matter of surprise, if, in one of the many prosecutions wherein the fame of Demosthenes was involved, the Dikasts had given a verdict unfavourable to him. That he always came off acquitted, and even honourably acquitted, is a proof of rare fidelity and steadiness of mind in the Athenians. It is a proof that those noble, patriotic, and Pan-hellenic sentiments, which we constantly find inculcated in his orations, throughout a period of twenty years, had sunk into the minds of his hearers; and that amidst the many general allegations of corruption against him, loudly proclaimed by his enemies, there was no one well-ascertained fact which they could substantiate before the Dikastery.

Verdict of the Dikasts—triumph of Demosthenes—exile of Æschines.

The indictment now preferred by Æschines against Ktesiphon only procured for Demosthenes a new triumph. When the suffrages of the Dikasts were counted, Æschines did not obtain so much as one-fifth. He became therefore liable to the customary fine of 1000 drachmæ. It appears that he quitted Athens immediately, without paying the fine, and retired into Asia, from whence he never returned. He is said to have opened a rhetorical school at

Rhodes, and to have gone into the interior of Asia during the last year of Alexander's life (at the time when that monarch was ordaining on the Grecian cities compulsory restoration of all their exiles), in order to procure assistance for returning to Athens. This project was disappointed by Alexander's death[1].

Causes of the exile of Æschines —he was the means of procuring coronation for Demosthenes.

We cannot suppose that Æschines was unable to pay the fine of 1000 drachmæ, or to find friends who would pay it for him. It was not therefore legal compulsion, but the extreme disappointment and humiliation of so signal a defeat, which made him leave Athens. We must remember that this was a gratuitous challenge sent by himself; that the celebrity of the two rivals had brought together auditors, not merely from Athens, but from various other Grecian cities; and that the effect of the speech of Demosthenes in his own defence,—delivered with all his perfection of voice and action, and not only electrifying hearers by the sublimity of its public sentiment, but also full of admirably managed self-praise, and contemptuous bitterness towards his rival—must have been inexpressibly powerful and commanding. Probably the friends of Æschines became themselves angry with him for having brought the indictment forward. For the effect of his defeat must have been that the vote of the Senate which he indicted, was brought forward and passed in the public assembly; and that Demosthenes must have received a public coronation[2].

[1] See the various lives of Æschines—in Westermann, Scriptores Biographici, pp. 268, 269.

[2] Demosthen. De Coronâ, p. 315. ἀλλὰ νυνὶ τήμερον ἐγὼ μὲν ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφανωθῆναι δοκιμάζομαι, τὸ δὲ μήδ' ὁτιοῦν ἀδικεῖν ἀνωμολόγημαι—

In no other way, under the existing circumstances of Athens, could Demosthenes have obtained so emphatic a compliment. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that such a mortification was insupportable to Æschines. He became disgusted with his native city. We read that afterwards, in his rhetorical school at Rhodes, he one day declaimed, as a lesson to his pupils, the successful oration of his rival, De Coronâ. Of course it excited a burst of admiration. "What, if you had heard the beast himself speak it!"—exclaimed Æschines.

B.C. 324. Subsequent accusation against Demosthenes, in the affair of Harpalus.

From this memorable triumph of the illustrious orator and defendant, we have to pass to another trial—a direct accusation brought against him, from which he did not escape so successfully. We are compelled here to jump over five years and a half (August 330 B.C. to January 324 B.C.), during which we have no information about Grecian history; the interval between Alexander's march into Baktria and his return to Persis and Susiana. Displeased with the conduct of the satraps during his absence, Alexander put to death or punished several, and directed the rest to disband without delay the mercenary soldiers whom they had taken into pay. This peremptory order filled both Asia and Europe with roving detachments of unprovided soldiers, some of whom sought subsistence in the Grecian islands and on the Lacedæmonian southern coast, at Cape Tænarus in Laconia.

σοὶ δὲ συκοφάντῃ μὲν εἶναι δοκεῖν ὑπάρχει, κινδυνεύεις δὲ εἴτε δεῖ σε ἔτι τοῦτο ποιεῖν, εἴτ' ἤδη πεπαῦσθαι μὴ μεταλαβόντα τὸ πέμπτον μέρος τῶν ψήφων, &c.

Yet Æschines had become opulent, according to Demosthenes, p. 329.

Flight of Harpalus to Athens—his previous conduct and relations with Athens.

It was about this period (the beginning of 324 B.C.) that Harpalus the satrap of Babylonia and Syria, becoming alarmed at the prospect of being punished by Alexander for his ostentatious prodigalities, fled from Asia into Greece, with a considerable treasure and a body of 5000 soldiers[1]. While satrap, he had invited into Asia, in succession, two Athenian women as mistresses, Pythionikê and Glykera, to each of whom he was much attached, and whom he entertained with lavish expense and pomp. On the death of the first, he testified his sorrow by two costly funereal monuments to her memory; one at Babylon, the other in Attica, between Athens and Eleusis. With Glykera he is said to have resided at Tarsus in Kilikia, —to have ordered that men should prostrate themselves before her, and address her as queen—and to have erected her statue along with his own at Rhossus, a seaport on the confines of Kilikia and Syria[2]. To please these mistresses, or perhaps to ensure a retreat for himself in case of need, he had sent to Athens profuse gifts of wheat for distribution among the people, for which he had received votes of thanks with the grant of Athenian citizenship[3]. Moreover he had consigned to Charikles, son-in-law of Phokion, the task of erecting

[1] Diodor. xvii. 108. He states the treasure brought out of Asia by Harpalus as 5000 talents.

[2] See the fragments of the letter or pamphlet of Theopompus addressed to Alexander, while Harpalus was still at Tarsus, and before his flight to Athens—Theopomp. Fragm. 277, 278, ed. Didot, ap. Athenæum, xiii. p. 586-595. Theopompus speaks in the present tense—καὶ ὁρᾷ (Harpalus) ὑπὸ τοῦ λάου προσκυνουμένην (Glykera), &c. Kleitarchus stated these facts, as well as Theopompus (Athenæ. ibid.).

[3] Athenæus, xiii. p. 596—the extract from the satirical drama called

the monument in Attika to the honour of Pythionikê; with a large remittance of money for the purpose[1]. The profit or embezzlement arising out of this expenditure secured to him the goodwill of Charikles—a man very different from his father-in-law, the honest and austere Phokion. Other Athenians were probably conciliated by various presents, so that when Harpalus found it convenient to quit Asia, about the beginning of 324 B.C., he had already acquired some hold both on the public of Athens and on some of her leading men. He sailed with his treasure and his armament straight to Cape Sunium in Attica, from whence he sent to ask shelter and protection in that city[2].

False reports conveyed to Alexander, that the Athenians had identified themselves with Harpalus.

The first reports transmitted to Asia appear to have proclaimed that the Athenians had welcomed Harpalus as a friend and ally, thrown off the Macedonian yoke, and prepared for a war to re-establish Hellenic freedom. Such is the colour of the case, as presented in the satyric drama called Agên, exhibited before Alexander in the Dionysiac festival at Susa, in February or March 324 B.C. Such news, connecting itself in Alexander's mind with the recent defeat of Zopyrion in Thrace and other

Agên, represented before Alexander at Susa, in the Dionysiac festival or early months of 324 B.C.

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 22; Pausanias, i. 37, 4; Dikæarchi Fragment. 72. ed. Didot.

Plutarch's narrative is misleading, inasmuch as it seems to imply that Harpalus gave this money to Charikles *after* his arrival at Athens. We know from Theopompus (Fr. 277) that the monument had been finished some time before Harpalus quitted Asia. Plutarch treats it as a mean structure, unworthy of the sum expended on it; but both Dikæarchus and Pausanias describe it as stately and magnificent.

[2] Curtius, x. 2, 1.

disorders of the disbanded mercenaries, incensed him so much, that he at first ordered a fleet to be equipped, determining to cross over and attack Athens in person[1]. But he was presently calmed by more correct intelligence, certifying that the Athenians had positively refused to espouse the cause of Harpalus[2].

The fact of such final rejection by the Athenians is quite indisputable. But it seems, as far as we B.C. 324.

[1] Curtius, x. 2, 1. "Igitur triginta navibus Sunium transmittunt" (Harpalus and his company), "unde portum urbis petere decreverunt. His cognitis, rex Harpalo Atheniensibusque juxta infestus, classem parari jubet, Athenas protinus petiturus." Compare Justin, xiii. 5, 7—who mentions this hostile intention in Alexander's mind, but gives a different account of the cause of it.

The extract from the drama *Agên* (given in Athenæus, xiii. p. 596) represents the reports which excited this anger of Alexander. It was said that Athens had repudiated her slavery, with the abundance which she had before enjoyed under it,—to enter upon a struggle for freedom, with the certainty of present privations and future ruin:—

A. ὅτε μὲν ἔφασκον (the Athenians) δοῦλον ἐκτῆσθαι βίον,
ἱκανὸν ἐδείπνουν· νῦν δὲ, τὸν χέδροπα μόνον
καὶ τὸν μάραθον ἔσθουσι, πυροὺς δ' οὐ μάλα.
B. καὶ μὴν ἀκούω μυριάδας τὸν Ἅρπαλον
αὐτοῖσι τῶν Ἀγῆνος οὐκ ἐλάττονας
σίτου παραπέμψαι, καὶ πολίτην γεγονέναι.
A. Γλυκέρας ὁ σῖτος οὗτος ἦν· ἐστὶν δ' ἴσως
αὐτοῖσιν ὀλέθρου κοὐκ ἑταίρας ἀρραβών.

I conceive this drama Agên to have been represented on the banks of the *Choaspes* (not the *Hydaspes*—see my note in the Chapter immediately preceding, p. 323), that is, at Susa, in the Dionysia of 324 B.C. It is interesting as a record of the feelings of the time.

[2] Nevertheless the impression, that Alexander was intending to besiege Athens, must have prevailed in the army for several months longer, during the autumn of 324 B.C., when he was at Ekbatana. Ephippus the historian, in recounting the flatteries addressed to Alexander at Ekbatana, mentions the rhodomontade of a soldier named Gorgus—Γόργος ὁ ὁπλοφύλαξ Ἀλέξανδρον Ἄμμωνος υἱὸν στεφανοῖ χρυσοῖς τρισχιλίοις, καὶ ὅταν Ἀθήνας πολιορκῇ, μυρίαις πανοπλίαις καὶ ταῖς ἴσαις καταπέλταις καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις βέλεσιν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἱκανοῖς (Ephippus ap. Athenæum, xii. p. 538. Fragment. 3. ed. Didot.).

Circumstances attending the arrival of Harpalus at Sunium—debate in the Athenian assembly—promises held out by Harpalus—the Athenians seem at first favourably disposed towards him.

can make out from imperfect evidence, that this step was not taken without debate, nor without symptoms of a contrary disposition, sufficient to explain the rumours first sent to Alexander. The first arrival of Harpalus with his armament at Sunium, indeed, excited alarm, as if he were coming to take possession of Peiræus; and the admiral Philokles was instructed to adopt precautions for defence of the harbour[1]. But Harpalus, sending away his armament to Krete or to Tænarus, solicited and obtained permission to come to Athens, with a single ship and his own personal attendants. What was of still greater moment, he brought with him a large sum of money, amounting, we are told, to upwards of 700 talents, or more than £160,000. We must recollect that he was already favourably known to the people by large presents of corn, which had procured for him a vote of citizenship. He now threw himself upon their gratitude as a suppliant seeking protection against the wrath of Alexander; and while entreating from the Athenians an interference so hazardous to themselves, he did not omit to encourage them by exaggerating the means at his own disposal. He expatiated on the universal hatred and discontent felt against Alexander, and held out assurance of being joined by powerful allies, foreign as well as Greek, if once a city like Athens would

[1] Deinarchus adv. Philokl. s. 1. *φάσκων κωλύσειν Ἅρπαλον εἰς τὸν Πειραῖα καταπλεῦσαι, στρατηγὸς ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὰ νεώρια καὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν κεχειροτονημένος*, &c. Deinarchus adv. Aristogeiton. s. 4. *ὃς παρ' Ἁρπάλου λαβεῖν χρήματα ἐτόλμησεν, ὃν ἤσθεθ' ἥκειν καταληψόμενον τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν*, &c.

raise the standard of liberation[1]. To many Athenian patriots, more ardent than long-sighted, such appeals inspired both sympathy and confidence. Moreover Harpalus would of course purchase every influential partisan who would accept a bribe; in addition to men like Charikles, who were already in his interest. His cause was espoused by Hyperides[2], an earnest anti-Macedonian citizen, and an orator second only to Demosthenes. There seems good reason for believing that at first, a strong feeling was excited in favour of taking part with the exile; the people not being daunted even by the idea of war with Alexander[3].

[1] See the new and interesting, though unfortunately scanty, fragments of the oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes, published and elucidated by Mr. Churchill Babington from a recently discovered Egyptian papyrus (Cambridge, 1850). From Fragm. 14 (p. 38 of Mr. Babington's edition) we may see that the promises mentioned in the text were actually held out by Harpalus—indeed we might almost have presumed it without positive evidence. Hyperides addresses Demosthenes—*ταύτας ὑπ.....ις τῷ ψηφίσματι, συλλαβὼν τὸν Ἅρπαλον· καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἅπαντας πρεσβεύεσθαι πεποίηκας ὡς Ἀλέξανδρον, οὐκ ἔχοντας ἄλλην οὐδεμίαν ἀποστροφήν· τοὺς δὲ βαρβάρους, οἱ αὐτοὶ ἂν ἦκον φέροντες εἰς ταὐτὸ τὴν δύναμιν, ἔχοντες τὰ χρήματα καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας ὅσους ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἶχε, τούτους σύμπαντας οὐ μόνον κεκώλυκας ἀποστῆναι ἐκείνου τῇ συλλήψει τοῦ Ἁρπάλου, ἀλλὰ καὶ.....*

From the language thus used by Hyperides in his accusation, we are made to perceive what prospects he (and of course Harpalus, upon whose authority he must have spoken) had held out to the people when the case was first under discussion.

The fragment here cited is complete as to the main sense, not requiring very great help from conjecture. In some of the other fragments, the conjectural restorations of Mr. Babington, though highly probable and judicious, form too large a proportion of the whole to admit of our citing them with confidence as testimony.

[2] Pollux, x. 159.

[3] Plutarch, De Vitioso Pudore, p. 531. *τῶν γὰρ Ἀθηναίων ὡρμημένων Ἁρπάλῳ βοηθεῖν, καὶ κορυσσόντων ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, ἐξαίφνης ἐπεφάνη Φιλόξενος, ὁ τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ πραγμάτων Ἀλεξάνδρου στρατηγός·*

Phokion and Demosthenes both agree in dissuading the Athenians from taking up Harpalus.

Phokion, whom Harpalus vainly endeavoured to corrupt, resisted of course the proposition of espousing his cause. And Demosthenes also resisted it, not less decidedly, from the very outset[1]. Notwithstanding all his hatred of Macedonian supremacy, he could not be blind to the insanity of declaring war against Alexander. Indeed those who study his orations throughout, will find his counsels quite as much distinguished for prudence as for vigorous patriotism. His prudence, on this occasion, however, proved injurious to his political position; for while it incensed Hyperides and the more sanguine anti-Macedonians, it probably did not gain for himself anything beyond a temporary truce from his old macedonising opponents.

Demand by Antipater for the surrender of Harpalus—the Athenians refuse to comply, but they arrest Harpalus and sequestrate his treasure for Alexander.

The joint opposition of politicians so discordant as Demosthenes and Phokion, prevailed over the impulse which the partisans of Harpalus had created. No decree could be obtained in his favour. Presently however the case was complicated by the coming of envoys from Antipater and Olympias in Macedonia, requiring that he should be surrendered[2]. The like requisition was also addressed by the Macedonian admiral Philoxenus, who arrived with a small squadron from Asia. These demands were refused, at the instance of Phokion no less than of Demosthenes. Nevertheless the prospects of Macedonian vengeance were now brought in such fearful proximity before the people, that all

ἐκπλαγέντος δὲ τοῦ δήμου, καὶ σιωπῶντος διὰ τὸν φόβον, ὁ Δημοσθένης— Τί ποιήσουσιν, ἔφη, πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἰδόντες, οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι πρὸς τὸν λύχνον ἀντιβλέπειν;

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, c. 21; Plutarch, Demosthen. 25.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 108.

disposition to support Harpalus gave way to the necessity of propitiating Alexander. A decree was passed to arrest Harpalus, and to place all his money under sequestration in the acropolis, until special directions could be received from Alexander; to whom, apparently, envoys were sent, carrying with them the slaves of Harpalus to be interrogated by him, and instructed to solicit a lenient sentence at his hands[1]. Now it was Demosthenes who moved these decrees for personal arrest and for sequestration of the money[2]; whereby he incurred still warmer resentment from Hyperides and the other Harpalian partisans, who denounced him as a subservient creature of the all-powerful monarch. Harpalus was confined, but presently made his escape; probably much to the satisfaction of Phokion, Demosthenes, and every one else; for even those who were most anxious to get rid of him would recoil from the odium and dishonour of surrendering him, even under constraint, to a certain death. He fled to Krete, where he was soon after slain by one of his own companions[3].

Demosthenes moves the decree for arrest of Harpalus, who is arrested, but escapes.

[1] Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 69. ἐὰν τοὺς παῖδας καταπέμψῃ (Alexander) πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς νῦν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀνακεκομισμένους, καὶ τούτων ἀξιοῖ τὴν ἀληθείαν πυθέσθαι, &c.

[2] See the fragment cited in a preceding note from the oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes. That it was *Demosthenes* who moved the decree for depositing the money in the acropolis, we learn also from one of his other accusers—the citizen who delivered the speech composed by Deinarchus (adv. Demosthen. sect. 68, 71, 89)—ἔγραψεν αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ δήμῳ Δημοσθένης, ὡς δηλόνοτι δικαίου τοῦ πράγματος ὄντος, φυλάττειν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τὰ εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀφικόμενα μετὰ Ἁρπάλου χρήματα.

Deinarchus (adv. Demosth. s. 97–106) accuses Demosthenes of base flattery to Alexander. Hyperides also makes the same charge—see the Fragments in Mr. Babington's edition, sect. 2. Fr. 11. p. 12; sect. 3. Fr. 5. p. 34.

[3] Pausan. ii. 33, 4; Diodor. xvii. 108.

Conduct of Demosthenes in regard to the treasure of Harpalus—deficiency of the sum counted and realized, as compared with the sum announced by Harpalus.

At the time when the decrees for arrest and sequestration were passed, Demosthenes requested a citizen near him to ask Harpalus publicly in the assembly, what was the amount of his money, which the people had just resolved to impound[1]. Harpalus answered, 720 talents; and Demosthenes proclaimed this sum to the people, on the authority of Harpalus, dwelling with some emphasis upon its magnitude. But when the money came to be counted in the acropolis, it was discovered that there was in reality no more than 350 talents. Now it is said that Demosthenes did not at once communicate to the people this prodigious deficiency in the real sum as compared with the announcement of Harpalus, repeated in the public assembly by himself. The impression prevailed, for how long a time we do not know, that 720 Harpalian talents had actually been lodged in the acropolis; and when the truth became at length known, great surprise and outcry were excited[2]. It was assumed that the missing half of the sum set forth must have been employed in corruption; and suspicions prevailed against almost all the orators, Demosthenes and Hyperides both included.

[1] This material fact, of the question publicly put to Harpalus in the assembly by some one at the request of Demosthenes, appears in the Fragments of Hyperides, p. 5, 7, 9, ed. Babington—*καθήμενος κάτω ὑπὸ τῇ κατατομῇ, ἐκέλευσε.....τὸν χορευτὴν ἐρωτῆσαι τὸν Ἅρπαλον ὅσα εἴη τὰ χρήματα τὰ ἀνοισθησόμενα εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν· ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι ἑπτακόσια*, &c.

The term *κατατομὴ* (see Mr. Babington's note) "designates a broad passage occurring at intervals between the concentrically arranged benches of seats in a theatre, and running parallel with them."

[2] Plutarch, Vit. X. Orat. p. 846. In the life of Demosthenes given by Photius (Cod. 265. p. 494) it is stated that only 308 talents were found.

In this state of doubt, Demosthenes moved that the Senate of Areopagus should investigate the matter and report who were the presumed delinquents[1] fit to be indicted before the Dikastery; he declared in the speech accompanying his motion that the real delinquents, whoever they might be, deserved to be capitally punished. The Areopagites delayed their report for six months, though Demosthenes is said to have called for it with some impatience. Search was made in the houses of the leading orators, excepting only one who was recently married[2]. At length the report appeared, enumerating several names of citizens chargeable with the appropriation of this money, and specifying how much had been taken by each. Among these names were Demosthenes himself, charged with 20 talents—Demades charged with 6000 golden staters—and other citizens, with different sums attached to their names[3]. Upon this report, ten[4] public accusers were appointed to prosecute the indictment against the persons specified, before the

Suspicions about this money—Demosthenes moves that the Areopagus shall investigate the matter—the Areopagites bring in a report against Demosthenes himself, with Demades and others, as guilty of corrupt appropriation. Demosthenes is tried on this charge, condemned, and goes into exile.

[1] That this motion was made by Demosthenes himself, is a point strongly pressed by his accuser Deinarchus—adv. Demosth. s. 5. 62. 84, &c.: compare also the Fragm. of Hyperides, p. 59, ed. Babington. Deinarchus, in his loose rhetoric, tries to put the case as if Demosthenes had proposed to recognise the sentence of the Areopagus as final and peremptory, and stood therefore condemned upon the authority invoked by himself. But this is refuted sufficiently by the mere fact that the trial was instituted afterwards; besides that it is repugnant to the judicial practice of Athens.

[2] Plutarch. Demosth, 26. We learn from Deinarchus (adv. Demosth. s. 46) that the report of the Areopagites was not delivered until after an interval of six months. About their delay and the impatience of Demosthenes, see Fragm. Hyperides, pp. 12-33, ed. Babington.

[3] Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 92. See the Fragm. of Hyperides in Mr. Babington, p. 18.

[4] Deinarchus adv. Aristogeiton., s. 6. Stratokles was one of the accusers.

Dikastery. Among the accusers was Hyperides, whose name had not been comprised in the Areopagitic report. Demosthenes was brought to trial, first of all the persons accused, before a numerous Dikastery of 1500 citizens[1], who confirmed the report of the Areopagites, found him guilty, and condemned him to pay fifty talents to the state. Not being able to discharge this large fine, he was put in prison; but after some days he found means to escape, and fled to Trœzen in Peloponnesus, where he passed some months as a dispirited and sorrowing exile, until the death of Alexander[2]. What was done with the other citizens included in the Areopagitic report, we do not know. It appears that Demades[3]—who was among those comprised, and who is especially attacked, along with Demosthenes, by both Hyperides and Deinarchus—did not appear to take his trial, and therefore must have been driven into exile; yet if so, he must have speedily returned, since he seems to have been at Athens when Alexander died. Philokles and Aristogeiton were also brought to trial as being included by the Areopagus in the list of delinquents; but how their trial ended, does not appear[4].

[1] Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 108, 109.

[2] Plutarch, Demosth. 26. [3] Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 104.

[4] See the two orations composed by Deinarchus, against Philokles and Aristogeiton.

In the second and third Epistles ascribed to Demosthenes (p. 1470, 1483, 1485), he is made to state, that he alone had been condemned by the Dikastery, because his trial had come on first—that Aristogeiton and all the others tried were acquitted, though the charge against all was the same, and the evidence against all was the same also—viz. nothing more than the simple report of the Areopagus. As I agree with those who hold these epistles to be probably spurious, I cannot believe, on such authority alone, that all the other persons tried were acquitted—a fact highly improbable in itself.

This condemnation and banishment of Demosthenes—unquestionably the greatest orator, and one of the greatest citizens, in Athenian antiquity, —is the most painful result of the debates respecting the exile Harpalus. Demosthenes himself denied the charge; but unfortunately we possess neither his defence, nor the facts alleged in evidence against him; so that our means of forming a positive conclusion are imperfect. At the same time, judging from the circumstances as far as we know them—there are several which go to show his innocence, and none which tend to prove him guilty. If we are called upon to believe that he received money from Harpalus, we must know for what service the payment was made. Did Demosthenes take part with Harpalus, and advise the Athenians to espouse his cause? Did he even keep silence, and abstain from advising them to reject the propositions? Quite the reverse. Demosthenes was from the beginning a declared opponent of Harpalus, and of all measures for supporting his cause. Plutarch indeed tells an anecdote—that Demosthenes began by opposing Harpalus, but that presently he was fascinated by the beauty of a golden cup among the Harpalian treasures. Harpalus, perceiving his admiration, sent to him on the ensuing night the golden cup, together with twenty talents, which Demosthenes accepted. A few days afterwards, when the cause of Harpalus was again debated in the public assembly, the orator appeared with his throat enveloped in woollen wrappers, and affected to have lost his voice; upon which the people, detecting this simu-

Was Demosthenes guilty of such corrupt appropriation? Circumstances as known in the case.

lated inability as dictated by the bribe which had been given, expressed their displeasure partly by sarcastic taunts, partly by indignant murmuring[1]. So stands the anecdote in Plutarch. But we have proof that it is untrue. Demosthenes may indeed have been disabled by sore throat from speaking at some particular assembly; so far the story may be accurate; but that he desisted from opposing Harpalus (the real point of the allegation against him) is certainly not true; for we know, from his accusers Deinarchus and Hyperides, that it was he who made the final motion for imprisoning Harpalus and sequestrating the Harpalian treasure in trust for Alexander. In fact, Hyperides himself denounces Demosthenes, as having, from subservience to Alexander, closed the door against Harpalus and his prospects[2]. Such direct and continued opposition is a conclusive proof that Demosthenes was neither paid nor bought by Harpalus. The only service which he rendered to the exile was, by refusing to deliver him to Antipater, and by not preventing his escape from imprisonment. Now in this refusal even Phokion concurred; and probably the best Athenians, of all parties, were desirous of favouring the escape of an exile whom it would have been odious to hand over to a Macedonian executioner. Insofar as it was a crime not to have prevented the escape of

Demosthenes could not have received money from Harpalus, since he opposed him from first to last.

[1] Plutarch, Demosth. 25: compare also Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 846; and Photius, Life of Demosth. Cod. 265. p. 494.

[2] See the fragment of Hyperides in Mr. Babington's edition, pp. 37, 38 (a fragment already cited in a preceding note), insisting upon the prodigious mischief which Demosthenes had done by his decree for arresting (σύλληψις) Harpalus.

Harpalus, the crime was committed as much by Phokion as by Demosthenes; and indeed more, seeing that Phokion was one of the generals, exercising the most important administrative duties—while Demosthenes was only an orator and mover in the assembly. Moreover, Harpalus had no means of requiting the persons, whoever they were, to whom he owed his escape; for the same motion which decreed his arrest, decreed also the sequestration of his money, and thus removed it from his own control[1].

Had Demosthenes the means of embezzling, after the money had passed out of the control of Harpalus? Answer in the negative.

The charge therefore made against Demosthenes by his two accusers,—that he received money *from* Harpalus,—is one which all the facts known to us tend to refute. But this is not quite the whole case. Had Demosthenes the means of embezzling the money, after it had passed out of the control of Harpalus? To this question also we may reply in the negative, so far as Athenian practice enables us to judge. Demosthenes had moved, and the people had voted, that these treasures should be lodged,

[1] In the Life of Demosthenes apud Photium (Cod. 265), the service alleged to have been rendered by him to Harpalus, and for which he was charged with having received 1000 Darics, is put as I have stated it in the text—Demosthenes first spoke publicly against receiving Harpalus, but presently *Δαρεικοὺς χιλίους (ὥς φασι) λαβὼν πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντας μετετάξατο* (then follow the particular acts whereby this alleged change of sentiment was manifested, which particular acts are described as follows)—*καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων Ἀντιπάτρῳ προδοῦναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀντεῖπεν, τά τε Ἁρπάλεια χρήματα εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἔγραψεν ἀποθέσθαι, μηδὲ τῷ δήμῳ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν ἀποσημηνάμενος.*

That Demosthenes should first oppose the reception of Harpalus—and then afterwards oppose the surrender of Harpalus to Antipater's requisition—is here represented as a change of politics, requiring the hypothesis of a bribe to explain it. But it is in reality no change at all. The two proceedings are perfectly consistent with each other, and both of them defensible.

in trust for Alexander, in the acropolis; a place where all the Athenian public money was habitually kept—in the back chamber of the Parthenon. When placed in that chamber, these new treasures would come under the custody of the officers of the Athenian exchequer; and would be just as much out of the reach of Demosthenes as the rest of the public money. What more could Phokion himself have done to preserve the Harpalian fund intact, than to put it in the recognized place of surety? Then, as to the intermediate process, of taking the money from Harpalus up to the acropolis, there is no proof,—and in my judgment no probability,—that Demosthenes was at all concerned in it. Even to count, verify, and weigh, a sum of above £80,000—not in bank notes or bills of exchange, but subdivided in numerous and heavy coins (staters, darics, tetradrachms), likely to be not even Attic, but Asiatic—must have been a tedious duty requiring to be performed by competent reckoners, and foreign to the habits of Demosthenes. The officers of the Athenian treasury must have gone through this labour, providing the slaves or mules requisite for carrying so heavy a burthen up to the acropolis. Now we have ample evidence, from the remaining Inscriptions, that the details of transferring and verifying the public property, at Athens, were performed habitually with laborious accuracy. Least of all would such accuracy be found wanting in the case of the large Harpalian treasure, where the very passing of the decree implied great fear of Alexander. If Harpalus, on being publicly questioned in the assembly—What was the sum to be

carried up into the acropolis,—answered by stating the amount which he had originally brought and not that which he had remaining—Demosthenes might surely repeat that statement immediately after him, without being understood thereby to bind himself down as guarantee for its accuracy. An adverse pleader, like Hyperides, might indeed turn a point in his speech[1]—"*You* told the assembly that there were 700 talents, and now *you* produce no more than half"—but the imputation wrapped up in these words against the probity of Demosthenes, is utterly groundless. Lastly, when the true amount was ascertained, to make report thereof was the duty of the officers of the treasury. Demosthenes could only learn it from them; and it might certainly be proper in him, though in no sense an imperative duty, to inform himself on the point, seeing that he had unconsciously helped to

[1] Fragm. Hyperides, p. 7, ed. Babington—ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἑπτακόσια φήσας εἶναι τάλαντα, νῦν τὰ ἡμίσυ ἀναφέρεις;

In p. 26 of the same Fragments, we find Hyperides reproaching Demosthenes for not having kept effective custody over the person of Harpalus; for not having proposed any decree providing a special custody; for not having made known beforehand, or prosecuted afterwards, the negligence of the ordinary gaolers. This is to make Demosthenes responsible for the performance of *all* the administrative duties of the city; for the good conduct of the treasurers and the gaolers.

We must recollect that Hyperides had been the loudest advocate of Harpalus, and had done all he could to induce the Athenians to adopt the cause of that exile against Alexander. One of the charges (already cited from his speech) against Demosthenes, is, that Demosthenes prevented this from being accomplished. Yet here is another charge from the same speaker, to the effect that Demosthenes did not keep Harpalus under effective custody for the sword of the Macedonian executioner!

The line of accusation taken by Hyperides is full of shameful inconsistencies.

give publicity to a false statement. The true statement was given; but we neither know by whom, nor how soon[1].

Accusatory speech of Deinarchus against Demosthenes—virulent invective destitute of facts.

Reviewing the facts known to us, therefore, we find them all tending to refute the charge against Demosthenes. This conclusion will certainly be strengthened by reading the accusatory speech composed by Deinarchus; which is mere virulent invective, barren of facts and evidentiary matter, and running over all the life of Demosthenes for the preceding twenty years. That the speech of Hyperides also was of the like desultory character, the remaining fragments indicate. Even the report made by the Areopagus contained no recital of facts—no justificatory matter—nothing except a specification of names with the sums for which each of them was chargeable[2]. It appears to have been made *ex-parte*, as far as we can judge—that is, made without hearing these persons in their own defence, unless they happened to be themselves Areopagites. Yet this report is held forth both by Hyperides and Deinarchus as being in itself conclusive proof which the Dikasts could not reject.

[1] In the Life of Demosthenes (Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 846), the charge of corruption against him is made to rest chiefly on the fact, that he did not make this communication to the people—καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μήτε τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀνακομισθέντων μεμηνύκως μήτε τῶν φυλασσόντων ἀμελείαν, &c. The biography apud Photium seems to state it as if Demosthenes did not communicate the amount, *at the time* when he proposed the decree of sequestration. This last statement we are enabled to contradict, from the testimony of Hyperides.

[2] Hyperid. Fragm. p. 18, ed. Babington. τὰς γὰρ ἀποφάσεις πάσας τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν χρημάτων Ἀρπάλου, πάσας ὁμοίως ἡ βουλὴ πεποίηται, καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς κατὰ πάντων· καὶ οὐδεμίᾳ προσγέγραφε, δι' ὅτι ἕκαστον ἀποφαίνει· ἀλλ' ἐπικεφάλαιον γράψασα, ὅσσον ἕκαστος εἴληφε χρυσίον, τοῦτ' οὖν ὀφειλέτω.....

When Demosthenes demanded, as every defendant naturally would, that the charge against him should be proved by some positive evidence, Hyperides sets aside the demand as nothing better than cavil and special pleading[1].

Change of mind respecting Demosthenes, in the Athenian public, in a few months.

One farther consideration remains to be noticed. Only nine months after the verdict of the Dikastery against Demosthenes, Alexander died. Presently the Athenians and other Greeks rose against Antipater in the struggle called the Lamian war. Demosthenes was then recalled; received from his countrymen an enthusiastic welcome, such as had never been accorded to any returning exile since the days of Alkibiades; took a leading part in the management of the war; and perished, on its disastrous termination, along with his accuser Hyperides.

Probable reality of the case, respecting the money of Harpalus, and the sentence of the Areopagus.

Such speedy revolution of opinion about Demosthenes, countenances the conclusion which seems to me suggested by the other circumstances of the case—that the verdict against him was not judicial, but political; growing out of the embarrassing necessities of the time.

[1] Hyperid. Frag. p. 20, ed. Babingt. ἐγὼ δ' ὅτι μὲν ἔλαβες τὸ χρυσίον, ἱκανὸν οἶμαι εἶναι σημεῖον τοῖς δικασταῖς, τὸ τὴν βουλὴν σοῦ καταγνῶναι (see Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 46, and the beginning of the second Demosthenic epistle).

Hyperid. p. 16, ed. Babingt. Καὶ συκοφαντεῖς τὴν βουλήν, προκλήσεις προτιθεὶς, καὶ ἐρωτῶν ἐν ταῖς προκλήσεσιν, πόθεν ἔλαβες τὸ χρυσίον, καὶ τίς ἦν σοὶ ὁ δούς, καὶ πῶς; τελευταῖον δ' ἴσως ἐρωτήσεις, καὶ εἰ ἐχρήσω τῷ χρυσίῳ, ὥσπερ τραπεζιτικὸν λόγον παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἀπαιτῶν.

This monstrous sentence creates a strong presumption in favour of the defendant,—and a still stronger presumption against the accuser. Compare Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 6, 7.

The biographer apud Photium states that Hyperides and four other orators procured (κατεσκεύασαν) the condemnation of Demosthenes by the Areopagus.

There can be no doubt that Harpalus, to whom a declaration of active support from the Athenians was matter of life and death, distributed various bribes to all consenting recipients, who could promote his views,—and probably even to some who simply refrained from opposing them; to all, in short, except pronounced opponents. If we were to judge from probabilities alone, we should say that Hyperides himself, as one of the chief supporters, would also be among the largest recipients[1]. Here was abundant bribery—notorious in the mass, though perhaps untraceable in the detail—all consummated during the flush of promise which marked the early discussions of the Harpalian case. When the tide of sentiment turned —when fear of Macedonian force became the overwhelming sentiment—when Harpalus and his treasures were impounded in trust for Alexander—all these numerous receivers of bribes were already compromised and alarmed. They themselves probably, in order to divert suspicion, were among the loudest in demanding investigation and punishment against delinquents. Moreover, the city was responsible for 700 talents to Alexander, while no more than 350 were forthcoming[2]. It was indispensable that some definite individuals should be pronounced guilty and punished, partly in order to put down the reciprocal criminations circulating through the city, partly in order to appease the displeasure of Alexander about the pecuniary defi-

[1] The biographer of Hyperides (Plutarch, Vit. X. Orat. p. 48) tells us that he was the only orator who kept himself unbribed; the comic writer Timokles names Hyperides along with Demosthenes and others as recipients (ap. Athenæ. viii. p. 342).

[2] See this point urged by Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 69, 70.

ciency. But how to find out who were the guilty? There was no official Prosecutor-general; the number of persons suspected would place the matter beyond the reach of private accusations; perhaps the course recommended by Demosthenes himself was the best, to consign this preliminary investigation to the Areopagites.

Six months elapsed before these Areopagites made their report. Now it is impossible to suppose that all this time could have been spent in the investigation of facts—and if it had been, the report when published would have contained some trace of these facts, instead of embodying a mere list of names and sums. The probability is, that their time was passed quite as much in party-discussions as in investigating facts; that dissentient parties were long in coming to an agreement whom they should sacrifice; and that when they did agree, it was a political rather than a judicial sentence, singling out Demosthenes as a victim highly acceptable to Alexander, and embodying Demades also, by way of compromise, in the same list of delinquents—two opposite politicians, both at the moment obnoxious. I have already observed that Demosthenes was at that time unpopular with both the reigning parties; with the philo-Macedonians, from long date, and not without sufficient reason; with the anti-Macedonians, because he had stood prominent in opposing Harpalus. His accusers count upon the hatred of the former against him, as a matter of course; they recommend him to the hatred of the latter, as a base creature of Alexander. The Di-

kasts doubtless included men of both parties; and as a collective body, they might probably feel, that to ratify the list presented by the Areopagus was the only way of finally closing a subject replete with danger and discord.

Such seems the probable history of the Harpalian transactions. It leaves Demosthenes innocent of corrupt profit, not less than Phokion; but to the Athenian politicians generally, it is noway creditable; while it exhibits the judicial conscience of Athens as under pressure of dangers from without, worked upon by party-intrigues within[1].

B.C. 324. Rescript of Alexander to the Grecian cities, directing that the exiles should be recalled in each.

During the half year and more which elapsed between the arrival of Harpalus at Athens, and the trial of Demosthenes, one event at least of considerable moment occurred in Greece. Alexander sent Nikanor to the great Olympic festival held in this year, with a formal letter or rescript, directing every Grecian city to recall all its citizens that were in exile, except such as were under the taint of impiety. The rescript, which was publicly read at the festival by the herald who had gained the prize for loudness of voice, was heard with the utmost enthusiasm by 20,000 exiles, who had mustered there from intimations that such a step was intended. It ran thus: "King Alexander to the exiles out of the Grecian cities. We have not been

[1] We read in Pausanias (ii. 33, 4) that the Macedonian admiral Philoxenus, having afterwards seized one of the slaves of Harpalus, learnt from him the names of those Athenians whom his master had corrupted; and that Demosthenes was *not* among them. As far as this statement goes, it serves to exculpate Demosthenes. Yet I cannot assign so much importance to it as Bishop Thirlwall seems to do. His narrative of the Harpalian transactions is able and discriminating (Hist. vol. vii. ch. 56. p. 170 *seqq.*).

authors of your banishment, but we will be authors of your restoration to your native cities. We have written to Antipater about this matter, directing him to apply force to such cities as will not recall you of their own accord[1]."

It is plain that many exiles had been pouring out their complaints and accusations before Alexander, and had found him a willing auditor. But we do not know by what representations this rescript had been procured. It would seem that Antipater had orders farther, to restrain or modify the confederacies of the Achæan and Arcadian cities[2]; and to enforce not merely recall of the exiles, but restitution of their properties[3].

Purpose of the rescript —to provide partisans for Alexander in each of the cities. Discontents in Greece.

That the imperial rescript was dictated by mistrust of the tone of sentiment in the Grecian cities generally, and intended to fill each city with devoted partisans of Alexander—we cannot doubt. It was on his part a high-handed and sweeping exercise of sovereignty—setting aside the conditions under which he had been named leader of Greece—disdaining even to inquire into particular cases, and to attempt a distinction between just and unjust sentences—overruling in the mass the political and judicial authorities in every city. It proclaimed with bitter emphasis the servitude of the Hellenic world. Exiles restored under the coercive order of Alexander were sure to look to Macedonia for support, to despise their own home authorities, and to fill their respective cities with enfeebling discord.

[1] Diodor. xix. 8.

[2] See the Fragments of Hyperides, p. 36, ed. Babington.

[3] Curtius, x. 2, 6.

Most of the cities, not daring to resist, appear to have yielded a reluctant obedience; but both the Athenians and Ætolians are said to have refused to execute the order[1]. It is one evidence of the disgust raised by the rescript at Athens, that Demosthenes is severely reproached by Deinarchus, because, as chief of the Athenian Theôry or sacred legation to the Olympic festival, he was seen there publicly consorting and in familiar converse with Nikanor[2].

In the winter or early spring of 323 B.C. several Grecian cities sent envoys into Asia to remonstrate with Alexander against the measure; we may presume that the Athenians were among them, but we do not know whether the remonstrance produced any effect[3]. There appears to have been considerable discontent in Greece during this winter and spring (323 B.C.). The disbanded soldiers out of Asia still maintained a camp at Tænarus; where Leosthenes, an energetic Athenian of anti-Macedonian sentiments, accepted the command of them, and even attracted fresh mercenary soldiers from Asia, under concert with various confederates at Athens, and with the Ætolians[4]. Of the money,

[1] Curtius, x. 2, 6. The statement of Diodorus (xviii. 8)—that the rescript was popular and acceptable to all Greeks, except the Athenians and Ætolians—cannot be credited. It was popular, doubtless, with the exiles themselves, and their immediate friends.

[2] Deinarchus adv. Demosth. s. 81: compare Hyperid. Fragm. p. 36, ed. Babington.

[3] Diodor. xvii. 113.

[4] Diodor. xvii. 111: compare xviii. 21. Pausanias (i. 25, 5; viii. 52, 2) affirms that Leosthenes brought over 50,000 of these mercenaries from Asia into Peloponnesus, during the lifetime of Alexander, and against Alexander's will. The number here given seems incredible; but it is probable enough that he induced some to come across.—Justin (xiii. 5)

said to be 5000 talents, brought by Harpalus out of Asia, the greater part had not been taken by Harpalus to Athens, but apparently left with his officers for the maintenance of the troops who had accompanied him over.

B.C. 323, summer.

Such was the general position of affairs, when Alexander died at Babylon in June 323 B.C. This astounding news, for which no one could have been prepared, must have become diffused throughout Greece during the month of July. It opened the most favourable prospects to all lovers of freedom and sufferers by Macedonian dominion. The imperial military force resembled the gigantic Polyphemus after his eye had been blinded by Odysseus[1]: Alexander had left no competent heir, nor did any one imagine that his vast empire could be kept together in effective unity by other hands. Antipater in Macedonia was threatened with the defection of various subject neighbours[2].

Effect produced in Greece by the death of Alexander.

The Athenians declare themselves champions of the liberation of Greece, in spite of Phokion's opposition.

No sooner was the death of Alexander indisputably certified, than the anti-Macedonian leaders in Athens vehemently instigated the people to declare themselves first champions of Hellenic freedom, and to organise a confederacy throughout Greece for that object. Demosthenes was then in exile; but Leosthenes, Hyperides and other orators of the same party, found themselves able to kindle

mentions that armed resistance was prepared by the Athenians and Ætolians against Alexander himself during the latter months of his life, in reference to the mandate enjoining recall of the exiles. He seems to overstate the magnitude of their doings before the death of Alexander.

[1] A striking comparison made by the orator Demades (Plutarch, Apophthegm, p. 181).

[2] See Frontinus, Stratagem., ii. 11, 4.

in their countrymen a strenuous feeling and determination, in spite of decided opposition on the part of Phokion and his partisans[1]. The rich men for the most part took the side of Phokion, but the mass of the citizens were fired by the animating recollection of their ancestors and by the hopes of reconquering Grecian freedom. A vote was passed, publicly proclaiming their resolution to that effect. It was decreed that 200 quadriremes, and 40 triremes should be equipped; that all Athenians under 40 years of age should be in military requisition; and that envoys should be sent round to the various Grecian cities, earnestly invoking their alliance in the work of self-emancipation[2]. Phokion, though a pronounced opponent of such warlike projects, still remained at Athens, and still, apparently, continued in his functions as one of the generals[3]. But Pytheas, Kallimedon, and others of his friends, fled to Antipater, whom they strenuously assisted in

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 23. In the Fragments of Dexippus, there appear short extracts of two speeches, seemingly composed by that author in his history of these transactions; one which he ascribes to Hyperides instigating the war, the other to Phokion, against it (Fragm. Hist. Græc. vol. iii. p. 668).

[2] Diodor. xviii. 10. Diodorus states that the Athenians sent the Harpalian treasures to the aid of Leosthenes. He seems to fancy that Harpalus had brought to Athens all the 5000 talents which he had carried away from Asia; but it is certain, that no more than 700 or 720 talents were declared by Harpalus in the Athenian assembly—and of these only half were really forthcoming. Moreover, Diodorus is not consistent with himself, when he says afterwards (xviii. 19) that Thimbron, who killed Harpalus in Krete, got possession of the Harpalian treasures and mercenaries, and carried them over to Kyrênê in Africa.

[3] It is to this season, apparently, that the anecdote (if true) must be referred—The Athenians were eager to invade Bœotia unseasonably; Phokion, as general of eighty years old, kept them back, by calling out the citizens of sixty years old and upwards for service, and offering to march himself at their head (Plutarch, Reip. Ger. Præcept. p. 818).

trying to check the intended movement throughout Greece.

Leosthenes, aided by some money and arms from Athens, put himself at the head of the mercenaries assembled at Tænarus, and passed across the Gulf into Ætolia. Here he was joined by the Ætolians and Akarnanians, who eagerly entered into the league with Athens for expelling the Macedonians from Greece. Proceeding onward towards Thermopylæ and Thessaly, he met with favour and encouragement almost everywhere. The cause of Grecian freedom was espoused by the Phokians, Lokrians, Dorians, Ænianes, Athamantes, and Dolopes; by most of the Malians, Œtæans, Thessalians, and Achæans of Phthiôtis; by the inhabitants of Leukas, and by some of the Molossians. Promises were also held out of cooperation from various Illyrian and Thracian tribes. In Peloponnesus, the Argeians, Sikyonians, Epidaurians, Trœzenians, Eleians, and Messenians, enrolled themselves in the league, as well as the Karystians in Eubœa[1]. These adhesions were partly procured by Hyperides and other Athenian envoys, who visited the several cities; while Pytheas and other envoys were going round in like manner to advocate the cause of Antipater. The two sides were thus publicly argued by able pleaders before different public assemblies. In these debates, the advantage was generally on the side of the Athenian orators, whose efforts moreover were powerfully seconded by the voluntary aid of Demosthenes, then living as an exile in Peloponnesus.

The Ætolians and many other Greeks join the confederacy for liberation —activity of the Athenian Leosthenes as general. Athenian envoys sent round to invite cooperation from the various Greeks.

[1] Diodor. xviii. 11; Pausanias, i. 25, 4.

Assistance lent to the Athenian envoys by Demosthenes, though in exile. He is recalled to Athens, and receives an enthusiastic welcome.

To Demosthenes the death of Alexander, and the new prospect of organizing an anti-Macedonian confederacy with some tolerable chance of success, came more welcome than to any one else. He gladly embraced the opportunity of joining and assisting the Athenian envoys, who felt the full value of his energetic eloquence, in the various Peloponnesian towns. So effective was the service which he thus rendered to his country, that the Athenians not only passed a vote to enable him to return, but sent a trireme to fetch him to Peiræus. Great was the joy and enthusiasm on his arrival. The archons, the priests, and the entire body of citizens, came down to the harbour to welcome his landing, and escorted him to the city. Full of impassioned emotion, Demosthenes poured forth his gratitude for having been allowed to see such a day, and to enjoy a triumph greater even than that which had been conferred on Alkibiades on returning from exile; since it had been granted spontaneously, and not extorted by force. His fine could not be remitted, consistently with Athenian custom; but the people passed a vote granting to him fifty talents as superintendent of the periodical sacrifice to Zeus Soter; and his execution of this duty was held equivalent to a liquidation of the fine[1].

What part Demosthenes took in the plans or details of the war, we are not permitted to know. Vigorous operations were now carried on, under the military command of Leosthenes. The confederacy against Antipater included a larger assemblage of Hellenic states than that which had re-

[1] Plutarch, Demosth. 27.

sisted Xerxes in 480 B.C. Nevertheless, the name of Sparta does not appear in the list. It was a melancholy drawback to the chances of Greece, in this her last struggle for emancipation, that the force of Sparta had been altogether crushed in the gallant but ill-concerted effort of Agis against Antipater seven years before, and had not since recovered. The great stronghold of Macedonian interest, in the interior of Greece, was Bœotia. Platæa, Orchomenus, and the other ancient enemies of Thebes, having received from Alexander the domain once belonging to Thebes herself, were well aware that this arrangement could only be upheld by the continued pressure of Macedonian supremacy in Greece. It seems probable also that there were Macedonian garrisons in the Kadmeia—in Corinth—and in Megalopolis; moreover, that the Arcadian and Achæan cities had been macedonized by the measures taken against them under Alexander's orders in the preceding summer[1]; for we find no mention made of these cities in the coming contest. The Athenians equipped a considerable land-force to join Leosthenes at Thermopylæ; a citizen force of 5000 infantry and 500 cavalry, with 2000 mercenaries besides. But the resolute opposition of the Bœotian cities hindered them from advancing beyond Mount Kithæron, until Leosthenes himself, marching from Thermopylæ to join them with a part of his army, attacked the Bœo-

B.C. 323, autumn.

Large Grecian confederacy against Antipater, nevertheless without Sparta.

Bœotia strongly in the Macedonian interest.

Leosthenes with the confederate army marches into Thessaly.

[1] See the fragments of Hyperides, p. 36, ed. Babington. καὶ περὶ τοῦ τοὺς κοινοὺς συλλόγους Ἀχαιῶν τε καὶ Ἀρκάδων..... We do not know what was done to these district confederacies, but it seems that some considerable change was made in them, at the time when Alexander's decree for restoring the exiles was promulgated.

tian troops, gained a complete victory, and opened the passage. He now proceeded with the full Hellenic muster, including Ætolians and Athenians, into Thessaly to meet Antipater, who was advancing from Macedonia into Greece at the head of the force immediately at his disposal—13,000 infantry and 600 cavalry—and with a fleet of 110 ships of war cooperating on the coast[1].

Battle in Thessaly—victory of Leosthenes over Antipater, who is compelled to throw himself into Lamia, and await succours from Asia—Leosthenes forms the blockade of Lamia: he is slain.

Antipater was probably not prepared for this rapid and imposing assemblage of the combined Greeks at Thermopylæ, nor for the energetic movements of Leosthenes. Still less was he prepared for the defection of the Thessalian cavalry, who, having always formed an important element in the Macedonian army, now lent their strength to the Greeks. He despatched urgent messages to the Macedonian commanders in Asia—Kraterus, Leonnatus, Philotas, &c., soliciting reinforcements; but in the mean time, though inferior in numbers, he thought it expedient to accept the challenge of Leosthenes. In the battle which ensued, however, he was completely defeated, and even cut off from the possibility of retreating into Macedonia; so that no resource was left to him except the fortified town of Lamia (near to the river Spercheius, beyond the southern border of Thessaly), where he calculated on holding out until relief came from Asia. Leosthenes immediately commenced the siege of Lamia, and pressed it with the utmost energy, making several attempts to storm the town; but its fortifications were strong, with a garrison ample and efficient—so that he was repulsed with considerable loss.

[1] Diodor. xviii. 13.

Unfortunately he possessed no battering train nor engineers, such as had formed so powerful an element in the military successes of Philip and Alexander. He therefore found himself compelled to turn the siege into a blockade, and to adopt systematic measures for intercepting the supply of provisions. In this he had every chance of succeeding, and of capturing the person of Antipater. Hellenic prospects looked bright and encouraging; nothing was heard in Athens and the other cities except congratulations and thanksgivings[1]. Phokion, on hearing the confident language of those around him, remarked—"The stadium (or short course) has been done brilliantly; but I fear we shall not have strength to hold out for the long course[2]." At this critical moment, Leosthenes, in inspecting the blockading trenches, was wounded on the head by a large stone, projected from one of the catapults on the city-walls, and expired in two days[3]. A funeral oration in his honour, as well as in that of the other combatants against Antipater, was pronounced at Athens by Hyperides, on whom the people devolved that duty in preference to Demosthenes.

Misfortune of the death of Leosthenes. Antiphilus is named in his place. Relaxed efforts of the Grecian army.

The death of this eminent general, in the full tide of success, was a hard blow struck by fortune at the cause of Grecian freedom. For the last generation, Athens had produced several excellent orators, and one who combined splendid oratory with wise and patriotic counsels. But during all that time, none of her citizens, before Læosthenes,

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 23, 24.
[2] Plutarch, Phokion, c. 23; Plutarch, Reip. Ger. Præcept. p. 803.
[3] Diodor. xviii. 12, 13.

had displayed military genius and ardour along with Panhellenic purposes. His death appears to have saved Antipater from defeat and captivity. The difficulty was very great, of keeping together a miscellaneous army of Greeks, who after the battle, easily persuaded themselves that the war was finished, and desired to go home—perhaps under promise of returning. Even during the lifetime of Leosthenes, the Ætolians, the most powerful contingent of the army, had obtained leave to go home, from some domestic urgency, real or pretended[1]. When he was slain, there was no second in command; nor, even if there had been, could the personal influence of one officer be transferred to another. Reference was made to Athens, where, after some debate, Antiphilus was chosen commander, after the proposition to name Phokion had been made and rejected[2]. But during this interval, there was no authority to direct military operations, or even to keep the army together; so that the precious moments for rendering the blockade really stringent, were lost, and Antipater was enabled to maintain himself until the arrival of Leonnatus from Asia to his aid. How dangerous the position of Antipater was, we may judge from the fact, that he solicited peace, but was required by the besiegers to surrender at discretion[3]—with which condition he refused to comply.

B.C. 323–322, autumn to winter.

Antiphilus appears to have been a brave and competent officer. But before he could reduce

[1] Diodor. xviii. 13–15.

[2] Plutarch, Phokion, 24.

[3] Diodor. xviii. 11; Plutarch, Phokion, 26.

Lamia, Leonnatus with a Macedonian army had crossed the Hellespont from Asia, and arrived at the frontiers of Thessaly. So many of the Grecian contingents had left the camp, that Antiphilus was not strong enough at once to continue the blockade and to combat the relieving army. Accordingly, he raised the blockade, and moved off by rapid marches to attack Leonnatus apart from Antipater. He accomplished this operation with vigour and success. Through the superior efficiency of the Thessalian cavalry under Menon, he gained an important advantage in a cavalry battle over Leonnatus, who was himself slain[1]; and the Macedonian phalanx, having its flanks and rear thus exposed, retired from the plain to more difficult ground, leaving the Greeks masters of the field with the dead bodies. On the very next day, Antipater came up with the troops from Lamia, and took command of the defeated army. He did not however think it expedient to renew the combat, but withdrew his army from Thessaly into Macedonia, keeping in his march the high ground, out of the reach of cavalry[2].

Leonnatus, with a Macedonian army from Asia, arrives in Thessaly. His defeat and death. Antipater escapes from Lamia, and takes the command.

During the same time generally as these operations in Thessaly, it appears that war was carried on actively by sea. We hear of a descent by Mikion with a Macedonian fleet at Rhamnus on the eastern coast of Attica, repulsed by Phokion; also of a Macedonian fleet, of 240 sail, under Kleitus, engaging in two battles with the Athenian fleet under Eetion, near the islands called Echinades, at the

War carried on by sea between the Macedonian and Athenian fleets.

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 25; Diodor. xviii. 14, 15: compare Plutarch, Pyrrhus, 1.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 15.

mouth of the Achelous, on the western Ætolian coast. The Athenians were defeated in both actions, and great efforts were made at Athens to build new vessels for the purpose of filling up the losses sustained[1]. Our information is not sufficient to reveal the purposes or details of these proceedings. But it seems probable that the Macedonian fleet were attacking Ætolia through Œniadæ, the citizens of which town had recently been expelled by the Ætolians[2]; and perhaps this may have been the reason why the Ætolian contingent was withdrawn from Thessaly.

B.C. 322, spring. Reluctance of the Greek contingents to remain on long-continued service. The army in Thessaly is thinned by many returning home.

In spite of such untoward events at sea, the cause of Pan-hellenic liberty seemed on the whole prosperous. Though the capital opportunity had been missed, of taking Antipater captive in Lamia, still he had been expelled from Greece, and was unable, by means of his own forces in Macedonia, to regain his footing. The Grecian contingents had behaved with bravery and unanimity in prosecution of the common purpose; and what had been already achieved was quite sufficient to justify the rising, as a fair risk, promising reasonable hopes of success. Nevertheless Greek citizens were not like trained Macedonian soldiers. After a term of service not much prolonged, they wanted to go back to their families and properties, hardly less after a victory than after a defeat. Hence the army of Antiphilus in Thessaly became much thinned[3], though still remaining large enough to keep back the Macedonian forces of Antipater, even augmented as they had been by Leonnatus—and to

[1] Diodor. xviii. 15. [2] Diodor. xviii. 8. [3] Diodor. xviii. 17.

compel him to await the still more powerful reinforcement destined to follow under Kraterus.

Expected arrival of Kraterus to reinforce Antipater. Relations between the Macedonian officers.

In explaining the relations between these three Macedonian commanders—Antipater, Leonnatus, and Kraterus—it is necessary to go back to June 323 B.C., the period of Alexander's death, and to review the condition into which his vast and mighty empire had fallen. I shall do this briefly, and only so far as it bears on the last struggles and final subjugation of the Grecian world.

State of the regal family, and of the Macedonian generals and soldiery, after the death of Alexander.

On the unexpected death of Alexander, the camp at Babylon with its large force became a scene of discord. He left no offspring, except a child named Herakles, by his mistress Barsinê. Roxana, one of his wives, was indeed pregnant; and amidst the uncertainties of the moment, the first disposition of many was to await the birth of her child. She herself, anxious to shut out rivalry, caused Statira, the queen whom Alexander had last married, to be entrapped and assassinated along with her sister[1]. There was however at Babylon a brother of Alexander, named Aridæus (son of Philip by a Thessalian mistress), already of full age though feeble in intelligence, towards whom a still larger party leaned. In Macedonia, there were Olympias, Alexander's mother—Kleopatra, his sister, widow of the Epirotic Alexander—and Kynanê[2], another sister, widow of Amyntas (cousin of Alexander the Great, and put to death by him); all of them disposed to take advantage of their relationship to the

[1] Plutarch, Alexand. 77.

[2] Arrian, De Rebus post Alexandrum, vi. ap. Photium, Cod. 92.

deceased conqueror, in the scramble now opened for power.

Philip Aridæus is proclaimed king: the satrapies are distributed among the principal officers.

After a violent dispute between the cavalry and the infantry at Babylon, Aridæus was proclaimed king under the name of Philip Aridæus. Perdikkas was named as his guardian and chief minister; among the other chief officers, the various satrapies and fractions of the empire were distributed. Egypt and Libya were assigned to Ptolemy; Syria to Laomedon; Kilikia to Philôtas; Pamphylia, Lykia, and the greater Phrygia, to Antigonus; Karia, to Asander; Lydia, to Menander; the Hellespontine Phrygia, to Leonnatus; Kappadokia and Paphlagonia, to the Kardian Eumenes; Media, to Pithon. The eastern satrapies were left in the hands of the actual holders.

In Europe, the distributors gave Thrace with the Chersonese to Lysimachus; the countries west of Thrace, including (along with Illyrians, Triballi, Agrianes, and Epirots) Macedonia and Greece, to Antipater and Kraterus[1]. We thus find the Grecian cities handed over to new masters, as fragments of the vast intestate estate left by Alexander. The empty form of convening and consulting a synod of deputies at Corinth, was no longer thought necessary.

Perdikkas the chief representative of central authority, assisted by Eumenes of Kardia.

All the above-named officers were considered as local lieutenants, administering portions of an empire one and indivisible under Aridæus. The principal officers who enjoyed central authority, bearing

[1] Arrian, De Rebus post Alexand. *ut supra*; Diodor. xviii. 3, 4; Curtius, x. 10; Dexippus, Fragmenta ap. Photium, Cod. 82. ap. Fragm. Hist. Græc. vol. iii. p. 667, ed. Didot (De Rebus Post Alexandrum).

on the entire empire, were, Perdikkas, chiliarch of the horse (the post occupied by Hephæstion until his death), a sort of vizir[1], and Seleukus, commander of the Horse Guards. No one at this moment talked of dividing the empire. But it soon appeared that Perdikkas, profiting by the weakness of Aridæus, had determined to leave to him nothing more than the imperial name, and to engross for himself the real authority. Still, however, in his disputes with the other chiefs, he represented the imperial family, and the integrity of the empire, contending against severalty and local independence. In this task (besides his brother Alketas), his ablest and most effective auxiliary was Eumenes of Kardia, secretary of Alexander for several years until his death. It was one of the earliest proceedings of Perdikkas to wrest Kappadokia from the local chief Ariarathes (who had contrived to hold it all through the reign of Alexander), and to transfer it to Eumenes, to whom it had been allotted in the general scheme of division[2].

List of projects entertained by Alexander at the time of his death. The generals dismiss them as too vast. Plans of Leonnatus and Kleopatra.

At the moment of Alexander's death, Kraterus was in Kilikia, at the head of an army of veteran Macedonian soldiers. He had been directed to conduct them home into Macedonia, with orders to remain there himself in place of Antipater, who was to come over to Asia with fresh reinforcements. Kraterus had with him a paper of written instructions from Alexander, embodying projects on the most gigantic scale; for western conquest—transporta-

[1] Arrian and Dexippus—De Reb. post Alex. *ut supra*: compare Diodor. xviii. 48.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 16.

tion of inhabitants by wholesale from Europe into Asia and Asia into Europe—erection of magnificent religious edifices in various parts of Greece and Macedonia, &c. This list was submitted by Perdikkas to the officers and soldiers around him, who dismissed the projects as too vast for any one but Alexander to think of[1]. Kraterus and Antipater had each a concurrent claim to Greece and Macedonia, and the distributors of the empire had allotted these countries to them jointly, not venturing to exclude either. Amidst the conflicting pretensions of these great Macedonian officers, Leonnatus also cherished hopes of the same prize. He was satrap of the Asiatic territory bordering upon the Hellespont, and had received propositions from Kleopatra at Pella, inviting him to marry her and assume the government of Macedonia. About the same time, urgent messages were also sent to him (through Hekatæus despot of Kardia) from Antipater, immediately after the defeat preceding the siege of Lamia, entreating his cooperation against the Greeks. Leonnatus accordingly came, intending to assist Antipater against the Greeks, but also to dispossess him of the government of Macedonia and marry Kleopatra[2]. This scheme remained unexecuted, because (as has been already related) Leonnatus was slain in his first encounter with the Greeks. To them, his death was a grave misfortune; to Antipater, it was an advantage which more than countervailed the defeat, since it relieved him from a dangerous rival.

B.C. 322. It was not till the ensuing summer that Kraterus

[1] Diodor. xviii. 4. [2] Plutarch, Eumenes, 3.

found leisure to conduct his army into Macedonia. By this junction, Antipater, to whom he ceded the command, found himself at the head of a powerful army—40,000 heavy infantry, 5000 cavalry, and 3000 archers and slingers. He again marched into Thessaly against the Greeks under Antiphilus; and the two armies came in sight on the Thessalian plains near Krannon. The Grecian army consisted of 25,000 infantry, and 3500 cavalry—the latter, Thessalians under Menon, of admirable efficiency. The soldiers in general were brave, but insubordinate; while the contingents of many cities had gone home without returning, in spite of urgent remonstrances from the commander. Hoping to be rejoined by these absentees, Antiphilus and Menon tried at first to defer fighting; but Antipater forced them to a battle. Though Menon with his Thessalian cavalry defeated and dispersed the Macedonian cavalry, the Grecian infantry were unable to resist the superior number of Antipater's infantry and the heavy pressure of the phalanx. They were beaten back and gave way, yet retiring in tolerable order, the Macedonian phalanx being incompetent for pursuit, to some difficult neighbouring ground, where they were soon joined by their victorious cavalry. The loss of the Greeks is said to have been 500 men; that of the Macedonians, 120[1].

Kraterus joins Antipater in Macedonia with a powerful army.

Battle of Krannon in Thessaly. Antipater gains a victory over the Greeks, though not a complete one.

The defeat of Krannon (August 322 B.C.) was no way decisive or ruinous, nor would it probably have crushed the spirit of Leosthenes, had he been alive and in command. The coming up of the absentee contingents might still have enabled the

[1] Diodor. xviii. 17; Plutarch, Phokion, 26.

Antiphilus tries to open negotiations with Antipater, who refuses to treat, except with each city singly. Discouragement among the Greeks. Each city treats separately. Antipater grants favourable terms to all, except Athenians and Ætolians.

Greeks to make head. But Antiphilus and Menon, after holding counsel, declined to await and accelerate that junction. They thought themselves under the necessity of sending to open negotiations for peace with Antipater; who however returned for answer, that he would not recognise or treat with any Grecian confederacy, and that he would receive no propositions except from each city severally. Upon this the Grecian commanders at once resolved to continue the war, and to invoke reinforcements from their countrymen. But their own manifestation of timidity had destroyed the chance that remained of such reinforcements arriving. While Antipater commenced a vigorous and successful course of action against the Thessalian cities separately, the Greeks became more and more dispirited and alarmed. City after city sent its envoys to entreat peace from Antipater, who granted lenient terms to each, reserving only the Athenians and Ætolians. In a few days, the combined Grecian army was dispersed; Antiphilus with the Athenians returned into Attica; Antipater followed them southward as far as Bœotia, taking up his quarters at the Macedonian post on the Kadmeia, once the Hellenic Thebes—within two days' march of Athens[1].

B C. 322. Against the overwhelming force thus on the frontiers of Attica, the Athenians had no means of defence. The principal anti-Macedonian orators, especially Demosthenes and Hyperides, retired from the city at once, seeking sanctuary in the temples of Kalauria and Ægina. Phokion and Demades,

[1] Diodor. xviii. 17; Plutarch, Phokion, c. 26.

as the envoys most acceptable to Antipater, were sent to Kadmeia as bearers of the submission of the city, and petitioners for lenient terms. Demades is said to have been at this time disfranchised and disqualified from public speaking—having been indicted and found guilty thrice (some say seven times) under the Graphê Paranomon; but the Athenians passed a special vote of relief, to enable him to resume his functions of citizen. Neither Phokion nor Demades, however, could prevail upon Antipater to acquiesce in anything short of the surrender of Athens at discretion; the same terms as Leosthenes had required from Antipater himself at Lamia. Kraterus was even bent upon marching forward into Attica, to dictate terms under the walls of Athens; and it was not without difficulty that Phokion obtained the abandonment of this intention; after which he returned to Athens with the answer. The people had no choice except to throw themselves on the mercy of Antipater[1]; and Phokion and Demades came back to Thebes to learn his determination. This time, they were accompanied by the philosopher Xenokrates—the successor of Plato and Speusippus, as presiding teacher in the school of the Academy. Though not a citizen of Athens, Xenokrates had long resided there; and it was supposed that his dignified character and intellectual eminence might be effi-

Antipater and his army in Bœotia—Athens left alone and unable to resist. Demosthenes and the other anti-Macedonian orators take flight. Embassy of Phokion, Xenokrates, and others to Antipater.

[1] Democharès, the nephew of Demosthenes, who had held a bold language and taken active part against Antipater throughout the Lamian war, is said to have delivered a public harangue recommending resistance even at this last moment. At least such was the story connected with his statue, erected a few years afterwards at Athens, representing him in the costume of an orator, but with a sword in hand—Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 847: compare Polybius, xii. 13.

cacious in mitigating the wrath of the conqueror. Aristotle had quitted Athens for Chalkis before this time; otherwise he, the personal friend of Antipater, would have been probably selected for this painful mission. In point of fact, Xenokrates did no good, being harshly received, and almost put to silence, by Antipater. One reason of this may be, that he had been to a certain extent the rival of Aristotle; and it must be added, to his honour, that he maintained a higher and more independent tone than either of the other envoys[1].

Severe terms imposed upon Athens by Antipater.

According to the terms dictated by Antipater, the Athenians were required to pay a sum equal to the whole cost of the war; to surrender Demosthenes, Hyperides, and seemingly at least two other anti-Macedonian orators; to receive a Macedonian garrison in Munychia; to abandon their democratical constitution and disfranchise all their poorer citizens. Most of these poor men were to be transported from their homes, and to receive new lands on a foreign shore. The Athenian colonists in Samos were to be dispossessed and the island retransferred to the Samian exiles and natives.

It is said that Phokion and Demades heard these terms with satisfaction, as lenient and reasonable. Xenokrates entered against them the strongest protest which the occasion admitted, when he said[2] —"If Antipater looks upon us as slaves, the terms are moderate; if as freemen, they are severe." To

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 27; Diodor. xviii. 18.

[2] Plutarch, Phokion, 27. Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι πρέσβεις ἠγάπησαν ὡς φιλανθρώπους τὰς διαλύσεις, πλὴν τοῦ Ξενοκράτους, &c. Pausanias even states (vii. 10, 1) that Antipater was disposed to grant more lenient terms, but was dissuaded from doing so by Demades.

Phokion's entreaty, that the introduction of the garrison might be dispensed with, Antipater replied in the negative, intimating that the garrison would be not less serviceable to Phokion himself than to the Macedonians; while Kallimedon also, an Athenian exile there present, repelled the proposition with scorn. Respecting the island of Samos, Antipater was prevailed upon to allow a special reference to the imperial authority.

Disfranchisement and deportation of the 12,000 poorest Athenian citizens.

If Phokion thought these terms lenient, we must imagine that he expected a sentence of destruction against Athens, such as Alexander had pronounced and executed against Thebes. Under no other comparison can they appear lenient. Out of 21,000 qualified citizens of Athens, all those who did not possess property to the amount of 2000 drachmæ were condemned to disfranchisement and deportation. The number below this prescribed qualification, who came under the penalty, was 12,000, or three-fifths of the whole. They were set aside as turbulent, noisy democrats; the 9000 richest citizens, the "party of order," were left in exclusive possession, not only of the citizenship, but of the city. The condemned 12,000 were deported out of Attica, some to Thrace, some to the Illyrian or Italian coast, some to Libya or the Kyrenaic territory. Besides the multitude banished simply on the score of comparative poverty, the marked anti-Macedonian politicians were banished also, including Agnonides, the friend of Demosthenes, and one of his earnest advocates when accused respecting the Harpalian treasures[1]. At the request of

[1] See Fragments of Hyperides adv. Demosth. p. 61–65, ed. Babington.

Phokion, Antipater consented to render the deportation less sweeping than he had originally intended, so far as to permit some exiles, Agnonides among the rest, to remain within the limits of Peloponnesus[1]. We shall see him presently contemplating a still more wholesale deportation of the Ætolian people.

Hardship suffered by the deported poor of Athens—Macedonian garrison placed in Munychia.

It is deeply to be lamented that this important revolution, not only cutting down Athens to less than one-half of her citizen population, but involving a deportation fraught with individual hardship and suffering, is communicated to us only in two or three sentences of Plutarch and Diodorus, without any details from contemporary observers. It is called by Diodorus a return to the Solonian constitution; but the comparison disgraces the name of that admirable lawgiver, whose changes, taken as a whole, were prodigiously liberal and enfranchising, compared with what he found established. The deportation ordained by Antipater must indeed have brought upon the poor citizens of Athens a state of suffering in foreign lands analogous to that

[1] Diodor. xviii. 18. *οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ὄντες πλείους τῶν μυρίων* (instead of *δισμυρίων*, which seems a mistake) *καὶ δισχιλίων μετεστάθησαν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος· οἱ δὲ τὴν ὡρισμένην τίμησιν ἔχοντες περὶ ἐννακισχιλίους, ἀπεδείχθησαν κύριοι τῆς τε πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς Σόλωνος νόμους ἐπολιτεύοντο.* Plutarch states the disfranchised as above 12,000.

Plutarch, Phokion, 28, 29. *Ὅμως δ' οὖν ὁ Φωκίων καὶ φυγῆς ἀπήλλαξε πολλοὺς δεηθεὶς τοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου· καὶ φεύγουσι διεπράξατο, μὴ καθάπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν μεθισταμένων ὑπὲρ τὰ Κεραύνια ὄρη καὶ τὸν Ταίναρον ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἀλλ' ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ κατοικεῖν, ὧν ἦν καὶ Ἀγνωνίδης ὁ συκοφάντης.*

Diodorus and Plutarch (c. 29) mention that Antipater assigned residences in Thrace for the expatriated. Those who went beyond the Keraunian mountains must have gone either to the Illyrian coast, Apollonia or Epidamnus—or to the Gulf of Tarentum. Those who went beyond Tænarus would probably be sent to Libya: see Thucydides, vii. 19, 10; vii. 50, 2.

which Solon describes as having preceded his Seisachtheia, or measure for the relief of debtors[1]. What rules the nine thousand remaining citizens adopted for their new constitution, we do not know. Whatever they did, must now have been subject to the consent of Antipater and the Macedonian garrison, which entered Munychia, under the command of Menyllus, on the twentieth day of the month Boedromion (September), rather more than a month after the battle of Krannon. The day of its entry presented a sorrowful contrast. It was the day on which, during the annual ceremony of the mysteries of Eleusinian Demeter, the multitudinous festal procession of citizens escorted the God Iacchus from Athens to Eleusis[2].

B.C. 322, October.

Demosthenes, Hyperides, and others, are condemned to death in their absence. Antipater sends officers to track and seize the Grecian exiles. He puts Hyperides to death.

One of the earliest measures of the nine thousand was, to condemn to death, at the motion of Demades, the distinguished anti-Macedonian orators who had already fled—Demosthenes, Hyperides, Aristonikus, and Himeræus, brother of the citizen afterwards celebrated as Demetrius the Phalerean. The three last having taken refuge in Ægina, and Demosthenes in Kalauria, all of them were out of the reach of an Athenian sentence, but not beyond that of the Macedonian sword. At this miserable season, Greece was full of similar exiles, the anti-Macedonian leaders out of all the cities which had taken part in the Lamian war. The officers of Antipater, called in the language of the time the Exile-Hunters[3],

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 28. ἐκπεπολιορκημένοις ἐῴκεσαν: compare Solon, Fragment 28, ed. Gaisford.

[2] Plutarch, Phokion, 28.

[3] Plutarch, Demosth. 28. Ἀρχίας ὁ κληθεὶς Φυγαδοθήρας. Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 846.

were everywhere on the look-out to seize these proscribed men; many of the orators, from other cities as well as from Athens, were slain; and there was no refuge except the mountains of Ætolia for any of them[1]. One of these officers, a Thurian named Archias, who had once been a tragic actor, passed over with a company of Thracian soldiers to Ægina, where he seized the three Athenian orators—Hyperides, Aristonikus, and Himeræus—dragging them out of the sanctuary of the Æakeion or chapel of Æakus. They were all sent as prisoners to Antipater, who had by this time marched forward with his army to Corinth and Kleonæ in Peloponnesus. All were there put to death, by his order. It is even said, and on respectable authority, that the tongue of Hyperides was cut out before he was slain; according to another statement, he himself bit it out—being put to the torture, and resolving to make revelation of secrets impossible. Respecting the details of his death, there were several different stories[2].

B.C. 322, October. Demosthenes in sanctuary at Kalauria—Archias with Thracian soldiers comes to seize him—he takes poison, and

Having conducted these prisoners to Antipater, Archias proceeded with his Thracians to Kalauria in search of Demosthenes. The temple of Poseidon there situated, in which the orator had taken sanctuary, was held in such high veneration, that Archias, hesitating to drag him out by force, tried to

[1] Polybius, ix. 29, 30. This is stated, as matter of traditional pride, by an Ætolian speaker more than a century afterwards. In the speech of his Akarnanian opponent, there is nothing to contradict it—while the fact is in itself highly probable.

See Westermann, Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland, ch. 71, note 4.

[2] Plutarch, Demosthen. 28; Plutarch, Vit. X. Orat. p. 849; Photius, p. 496.

persuade him to come forth voluntarily, under promise that he should suffer no harm. But Demosthenes, well aware of the fate which awaited him, swallowed poison in the temple, and when the dose was beginning to take effect, came out of the sacred ground, expiring immediately after he had passed the boundary. The accompanying circumstances were recounted in several different ways[1]. Eratosthenes (to whose authority I lean) affirmed that Demosthenes carried the poison in a ring round his arm; others said that it was suspended in a linen bag round his neck; according to a third story, it was contained in a writing-quill, which he was seen to bite and suck, while composing a last letter to Antipater. Amidst these contradictory details, we can only affirm as certain, that the poison which he had provided beforehand preserved him from the sword of Antipater, and perhaps from having his tongue cut out. The most remarkable assertion was that of Democharès, nephew of Demosthenes, made in his harangues at Athens a few years afterwards. Democharès asserted that his uncle had not taken poison, but had been softly withdrawn from the world by a special providence of the Gods, just at the moment essential to rescue him from the cruelty of the Macedonians. It is

[1] Plutarch, Demosth. 30. τῶν δ' ἄλλων, ὅσοι γεγράφασί τι περὶ αὐτοῦ, παμπολλοὶ δ' εἰσὶ, τὰς διαφορὰς οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἐπεξελθεῖν, &c.

The taunts on Archias's profession, as an actor, and as an indifferent actor, which Plutarch puts into the mouth of Demosthenes (c. 29), appear to me not worthy either of the man or of the occasion; nor are they sufficiently avouched to induce me to transcribe them. Whatever bitterness of spirit Demosthenes might choose to manifest, at such a moment, would surely be vented on the chief enemy, Antipater; not upon the mere instrument.

not less to be noted, as an illustration of the vein of sentiment afterwards prevalent, that Archias the Exile-Hunter was affirmed to have perished in the utmost dishonour and wretchedness[1].

Miserable condition of Greece—life and character of Demosthenes.

The violent deaths of these illustrious orators, the disfranchisement and deportation of the Athenian Demos, the suppression of the public Dikasteries, the occupation of Athens by a Macedonian garrison, and of Greece generally by Macedonian Exile-Hunters—are events belonging to one and the same calamitous tragedy, and marking the extinction of the autonomous Hellenic world. Of Hyperides as a citizen we know only the general fact, that he maintained from first to last, and with oratorical ability inferior only to Demosthenes, a strenuous opposition to Macedonian dominion over Greece; though his prosecution of Demosthenes respecting the Harpalian treasure appears (as far as it comes before us) discreditable. Of Demosthenes, we know more—enough to form a judgment of him both as citizen and statesman. At the time of his death he was about sixty-two years of age, and we have before us his first Philippic, delivered thirty years before (352–351 B.C.). We are thus sure, that even at that early day, he took a sagacious and provident measure of the danger which threatened Grecian liberty from the energy and encroachments of Philip. He impressed upon his countrymen this coming danger, at a time when the older and more influential politicians either could not or would not see it; he called aloud upon his fellow-citizens for personal service and pecuniary contributions, en-

[1] Plutarch, Demosth. 30; Plutarch, Vit. X. Orat. p. 846; Photius, p. 494; Arrian, De Rebus post Alexand. vi. ap. Photium, Cod. 92.

forcing the call by all the artifices of consummate oratory, when such distasteful propositions only entailed unpopularity upon himself. At the period when Demosthenes first addressed these earnest appeals to his countrymen, long before the fall of Olynthus, the power of Philip, though formidable, might have been kept perfectly well within the limits of Macedonia and Thrace; and would probably have been so kept, had Demosthenes possessed in 351 B.C. as much public influence as he had acquired ten years afterwards, in 341 B.C.

Throughout the whole career of Demosthenes as a public adviser, down to the battle of Chæroneia, we trace the same combination of earnest patriotism with wise and long-sighted policy. During the three years' war which ended with the battle of Chæroneia, the Athenians in the main followed his counsel; and disastrous as were the ultimate military results of that war, for which Demosthenes could not be responsible—its earlier periods were creditable and successful, its general scheme was the best that the case admitted, and its diplomatic management universally triumphant. But what invests the purposes and policy of Demosthenes with peculiar grandeur, is, that they were not simply Athenian, but in an eminent degree Panhellenic also. It was not Athens only that he sought to defend against Philip, but the whole Hellenic world. In this he towers above the greatest of his predecessors for half a century before his birth—Perikles, Archidamus, Agesilaus, Epaminondas; whose policy was Athenian, Spartan, Theban, rather than Hellenic. He carries us back to the time of the invasion of Xerxes and the generation immediately succeeding it, when

the struggles and sufferings of the Athenians against Persia were consecrated by complete identity of interest with collective Greece. The sentiments to which Demosthenes appeals throughout his numerous orations, are those of the noblest and largest patriotism; trying to inflame the ancient Grecian sentiment, of an autonomous Hellenic world, as the indispensable condition of a dignified and desirable existence[1]—but inculcating at the same time that these blessings could only be preserved by toil, self-sacrifice, devotion of fortune, and willingness to brave hard and steady personal service.

Dishonourable position of Phokion at Athens, under the miserable condition of the people, and the Macedonian occupation.

From the destruction of Thebes by Alexander in 335 B.C., to the Lamian war after his death, the policy of Athens neither was nor could be conducted by Demosthenes. But condemned as he was to comparative inefficacy, he yet rendered material service to Athens, in the Harpalian affair of 324 B.C. If, instead of opposing the alliance of the city with Harpalus, he had supported it as warmly as Hyperides—the exaggerated promises of the exile might probably have prevailed, and war would have been declared against Alexander. In respect to the charge of having been corrupted by Harpalus, I have already shown reasons for believing him innocent. The Lamian war, the closing scene of his activity, was not of his original suggestion, since he was in exile at its commencement. But he threw himself into it with unreserved ardour, and was greatly instrumental in procuring the large number of adhesions which it obtained from so many

[1] Demosthenes, De Corona, p. 324. *οὗτοι—τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὸ μηδένα ἔχειν δεσπότην αὐτῶν, ἃ τοῖς προτέροις Ἕλλησιν ὅροι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἦσαν καὶ κανόνες, ἀνατετραφότες*, &c.

Grecian states. In spite of its disastrous result; it was, like the battle of Chæroneia, a glorious effort for the recovery of Grecian liberty, undertaken under circumstances which promised a fair chance of success. There was no excessive rashness in calculating on distractions in the empire left by Alexander—on mutual hostility among the principal officers—and on the probability of having only to make head against Antipater and Macedonia, with little or no reinforcement from Asia. Disastrous as the enterprise ultimately proved, yet the risk was one fairly worth incurring, with so noble an object at stake; and could the war have been protracted another year, its termination would probably have been very different. We shall see this presently when we come to follow Asiatic events. After a catastrophe so ruinous, extinguishing free speech in Greece, and dispersing the Athenian Demos to distant lands, Demosthenes himself could hardly have desired, at the age of sixty-two, to prolong his existence as a fugitive beyond sea.

Of the speeches which he composed for private litigants, occasionally also for himself, before the Dikastery—and of the numerous stimulating and admonitory harangues, on the public affairs of the moment, which he had addressed to his assembled countrymen, a few remain for the admiration of posterity. These harangues serve to us, not only as evidence of his unrivalled excellence as an orator, but as one of the chief sources from which we are enabled to appreciate the last phase of free Grecian life, as an acting and working reality.

CHAPTER XCVI.

FROM THE LAMIAN WAR TO THE CLOSE OF THE HISTORY OF FREE HELLAS AND HELLENISM.

THE death of Demosthenes, with its tragical circumstances recounted in my last chapter, is on the whole less melancholy than the prolonged life of Phokion, as agent of Macedonian supremacy in a city half-depopulated, where he had been born a free citizen, and which he had so long helped to administer as a free community. The dishonour of Phokion's position must have been aggravated by the distress in Athens, arising both out of the violent deportation of one-half of its free citizens, and out of the compulsory return of the Athenian settlers from Samos; which island was now taken from Athens, after she had occupied it forty-three years, and restored to the Samian people and to their recalled exiles, by a rescript of Perdikkas in the name of Aridæus[1]. Occupying this obnoxious elevation, Phokion exercised authority with his usual probity and mildness. Exerting himself to guard the citizens from being annoyed by disorders on the part of the garrison of Munychia, he kept

[1] Diodor. xviii. 18; Diogen. Laert. x. 1, 1. I have endeavoured to show, in the Tenth Volume of this History (Ch. lxxix. p. 407, note), that Diodorus is correct in giving forty-three years, as the duration of the Athenian Kleruchies in Samos; although both Wesseling and Mr. Clinton impugn his statement. The Athenian occupation of Samos *began* immediately after the conquest of the island by Timotheus, in 366-365 B.C.; but additional batches of colonists were sent thither in later years.

up friendly intercourse with its commander Menyllus, though refusing all presents both from him and from Antipater. He was anxious to bestow the gift of citizenship upon the philosopher Xenokrates, who was only a metic, or resident non-freeman; but Xenokrates declined the offer, remarking, that he would accept no place in a constitution against which he had protested as envoy[1]. This mark of courageous independence, not a little remarkable while the Macedonians were masters of the city, was a tacit reproach to the pliant submission of Phokion.

B.C. 322 to 321, autumn to winter. Antipater purges and remodels the Peloponnesian cities. He attacks the Ætolians, with a view of deporting them across to Asia. His presence becomes necessary in Asia: he concludes a pacification with the Ætolians.

Throughout Peloponnesus, Antipater purged and remodelled the cities, Argos, Megalopolis, and others, as he had done at Athens; installing in each an oligarchy of his own partisans—sometimes with a Macedonian garrison—and putting to death, deporting, or expelling, hostile, or intractable, or democratical citizens[2]. Having completed the subjugation of Peloponnesus, he passed across the Corinthian Gulf to attack the Ætolians, now the only Greeks remaining unsubdued. It was the purpose of Antipater, not merely to conquer this warlike and rude people, but to transport them in mass across into Asia, and march them up to the interior deserts of

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 29, 30.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 55, 56, 57, 68, 69. φανεροῦ δ' ὄντος, ὅτι Κάσσανδρος τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πόλεων ἀνθέξεται, διὰ τὸ τὰς μὲν αὐτῶν πατρικαῖς φρουραῖς φυλάττεσθαι, τὰς δ' ὑπ' ὀλιγαρχιῶν διοικεῖσθαι, κυριευομένας ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀντιπάτρου φίλων καὶ ξένων.

That citizens were not only banished, but deported, by Antipater from various other cities besides Athens, we may see from the edict issued by Polysperchon shortly after the death of Antipater (Diod. xviii. 56)—καὶ τοὺς μεταστάντας ἢ φυγόντας ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων στρατηγῶν (*i. e.* Antipater and Kraterus), ἀφ' ὧν χρόνων Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διέβη, κατάγομεν, &c.

the empire[1]. His army was too powerful to be resisted on even ground, so that all the more accessible towns and villages fell into his hands. But the Ætolians defended themselves bravely, withdrew their families into the high towns and mountain tops of their very rugged country, and caused serious loss to the Macedonian invaders. Nevertheless, Kraterus, who had carried on war of the same kind with Alexander in Sogdiana, manifested so much skill in seizing the points of communication, that he intercepted all their supplies and reduced them to extreme distress, amidst the winter which had now supervened. The Ætolians, in spite of bravery and endurance, must soon have been compelled to surrender from cold and hunger, had not the unexpected arrival of Antigonus from Asia communicated such news to Antipater and Kraterus, as induced them to prepare for marching back to Macedonia, with a view to the crossing of the Hellespont and operating in Asia. They concluded a pacification with the Ætolians—postponing till a future period their design of deporting that people,—and withdrew into Macedonia; where Antipater cemented his alliance with Kraterus by giving to him his daughter Phila in marriage[2].

Intrigues with Perdikkas, and with the princesses at Pella.

Another daughter of Antipater, named Nikæa, had been sent over to Asia not long before, to become the wife of Perdikkas. That general, acting as guardian or prime minister to the kings of Alexander's family (who are now spoken of in the plural number, since Roxana had given birth to a

[1] Diodor. xviii. 25. *διεγνωκότες ὕστερον αὐτοὺς καταπολεμῆσαι, καὶ μεταστῆσαι πανοικίους ἅπαντας εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν καὶ ποῤῥωτάτω τῆς Ἀσίας κειμένην χώραν.*

[2] Diodor. xviii. 18-25.

posthumous son, called Alexander, and made king jointly with Philip Aridæus), had at first sought close combination with Antipater, demanding his daughter in marriage. But new views were presently opened to him by the intrigues of the princesses at Pella (Olympias, with her daughter Kleopatra, widow of the Molossian Alexander)—who had always been at variance with Antipater, even throughout the life of Alexander—and Kynanê (daughter of Philip by an Illyrian mother, and widow of Amyntas, first cousin of Alexander, but slain by Alexander's order) with her daughter Eurydikê. It has been already mentioned that Kleopatra had offered herself in marriage to Leonnatus, inviting him to come over and occupy the throne of Macedonia: he had obeyed the call, but had been slain in his first battle against the Greeks, thus relieving Antipater from a dangerous rival. The first project of Olympias being thus frustrated, she had sent to Perdikkas proposing to him a marriage with Kleopatra. Perdikkas had already pledged himself to the daughter of Antipater; nevertheless he now debated whether his ambition would not be better served by breaking his pledge, and accepting the new proposition. To this step he was advised by Eumenes, his ablest friend and coadjutor, steadily attached to the interest of the regal family, and withal personally hated by Antipater. But Alketas, brother of Perdikkas, represented that it would be hazardous to provoke openly and immediately the wrath of Antipater. Accordingly Perdikkas resolved to accept Nikæa for the moment, but to send her away after no long

time, and take Kleopatra; to whom secret assurances from him were conveyed by Eumenes. Kynanê also (daughter of Philip and widow of his nephew Amyntas) a warlike and ambitious woman, had brought into Asia her daughter Eurydikê for the purpose of espousing the king Philip Aridæus. Being averse to this marriage, and probably instigated by Olympias also, Perdikkas and Alketas put Kynanê to death. But the indignation excited among the soldiers by this deed was so furious as to menace their safety, and they were forced to permit the marriage of the king with Eurydikê[1].

Antigonus detects the intrigues, and reveals them to Antipater and Kraterus.

All these intrigues were going on through the summer of 322 B.C., while the Lamian war was still effectively prosecuted by the Greeks. About the autumn of the year, Antigonus (called Monophthalmus), the satrap of Phrygia, detected these secret intrigues of Perdikkas; who, for that and other reasons, began to look on him as an enemy, and to plot against his life. Apprised of his danger, Antigonus made his escape from Asia into Europe to acquaint Antipater and Kraterus with the hostile manœuvres of Perdikkas; upon which news, the two generals, immediately abandoning the Ætolian war, withdrew their army from Greece for the more important object of counteracting Perdikkas in Asia.

[1] Diodor. xviii. 23; Arrian, De Rebus post Alex. vi. ap. Phot. Cod. 92. Diodorus alludes to the murder of Kynanê or Kynna, in another place (xix. 52).

Compare Polyænus, viii. 60—who mentions the murder of Kynanê by Alketas, but gives a somewhat different explanation of her purpose in passing into Asia.

About Kynanê, see Duris, Fragm. 24, in Fragment. Hist. Græc. vol. ii. p. 475; Athenæ. xiii. p. 560.

To us, these contests of the Macedonian officers belong only so far as they affect the Greeks. And we see, by the events just noticed, how unpropitious to the Greeks were the turns of Fortune, throughout the Lamian war: the grave of Grecian liberty, not for the actual combatants only, but for their posterity also[1]. Until the battle of Krannon and the surrender of Athens, everything fell out so as to relieve Antipater from embarrassment, and impart to him double force. The intrigues of the princesses at Pella, who were well known to hate him, first raised up Leonnatus, next Perdikkas, against him. Had Leonnatus lived, the arm of Antipater would have been at least weakened, if not paralysed; had Perdikkas declared himself earlier, the forces of Antipater must have been withdrawn to oppose him, and the battle of Krannon would probably have had a different issue. As soon as Perdikkas became hostile to Antipater, it was his policy to sustain and seek alliance with the Greeks, as we shall find him presently doing with the Ætolians[2]. Through causes thus purely accidental, Antipater obtained an interval of a few months, during which his hands were not only free,

Unpropitious turns of fortune for the Greeks, in reference to the Lamian war.

[1] The fine lines of Lucan (Phars. vii. 640) on the effects of the battle of Pharsalia, may be cited here:—

"Majus ab hac acie, quam quod sua sæcula ferrent,
Vulnus habent populi: plus est quam vita salusque
Quod perit: in totum mundi prosternimur ævum.
Vincitur his gladiis omnis, quæ serviet, ætas.
Proxima quid soboles, aut quid meruere nepotes,
In regnum nasci?" &c.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 38. Ἀντιπάτρου δ' εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότος, Αἰτωλοὶ κατὰ τὰς πρὸς Περδίκκαν συνθήκας ἐστράτευσαν εἰς τὴν Θετταλίαν, &c.

but armed with new and unexpected strength from Leonnatus and Kraterus, to close the Lamian war. The disastrous issue of that war was therefore in great part the effect of casualties, among which we must include the death of Leosthenes himself. Such issue is not to be regarded as proving that the project was desperate or ill-conceived on the part of its promoters, who had full right to reckon, among the probabilities of their case, the effects of discord between the Macedonian chiefs.

B.C. 321. Antipater and Kraterus in Asia—Perdikkas marches to attack Ptolemy in Egypt, but is killed by a mutiny of his own troops. Union of Antipater, Ptolemy, Antigonus, &c. New distribution of the satrapies, made at Triparadisus.

In the spring of 321 B.C., Antipater and Kraterus, having concerted operations with Ptolemy governor of Egyyt, crossed into Asia and began their conflict with Perdikkas; who himself, having the kings along with him, marched against Egypt to attack Ptolemy; leaving his brother Alketas, in conjunction with Eumenes as general, to maintain his cause in Kappadokia and Asia Minor. Alketas, discouraged by the adverse feeling of the Macedonians generally, threw up the enterprize as hopeless. But Eumenes, though embarrassed and menaced in every way by the treacherous jealousy of his own Macedonian officers, and by the discontent of the soldiers against him as a Greek—and though compelled to conceal from these soldiers the fact that Kraterus, who was popular among them, commanded on the opposite side,—displayed nevertheless so much ability that he gained an important victory[1], in which both Neoptolemus and Kraterus perished. Neoptolemus was killed by Eumenes

[1] Plutarch, Eumenes, 7; Cornel. Nepos, Eumenes, c. 4. Eumenes had trained a body of Asiatic and Thracian cavalry to fight in close combat with the short pike and sword of the Macedonian Companions

with his own hand, after a personal conflict desperate in the extreme and long doubtful, and at the cost of a severe wound to himself[1]. After the victory, he found Kraterus still alive, though expiring from his wound. Deeply afflicted at the sight, he did his utmost to restore the dying man; and when this proved to be impossible, caused his dead body to be honourably shrouded and transmitted into Macedonia for burial.

This new proof of the military ability and vigour of Eumenes, together with the death of two such important officers as Kraterus and Neoptolemus—proved ruinous to the victor himself, without serving the cause in which he fought. Perdikkas his chief did not live to hear of it. That general was so overbearing and tyrannical in his demeanour towards the other officers—and withal so unsuccessful in his first operations against Ptolemy on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile—that his own army mutinied and slew him[2]. His troops joined Ptolemy, whose conciliatory behaviour gained their goodwill. Only two days after this revolution, a messenger from Eumenes reached the camp, announcing his victory and the death of Kraterus. Had this intelligence been received by Perdikkas himself at the head of his army, the course of subsequent events might have been sensibly altered. Eumenes would

—relinquishing thej avelin, the missiles, and the alternation of charging and retiring, usual to Asiatics.

Diodorus (xviii. 30, 31, 32) gives an account at some length of this battle. He as well as Plutarch may probably have borrowed from Hieronymus of Kardia.

[1] Arrian, ap. Photium, Cod. 92; Justin, xiii. 8; Diodor. xviii. 33.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 36.

have occupied the most commanding position in Asia, as general of the kings of the Alexandrine family, to whom both his interests and his feelings attached him. But the news, arriving at the moment when it did, caused throughout the army only the most violent exasperation against him; not simply as ally of the odious Perdikkas, but as cause of death to the esteemed Kraterus. He, together with Alketas and fifty officers, was voted by the soldiers a public enemy. No measures were kept with him henceforward by Macedonian officers or soldiers. At the same time several officers attached to Perdikkas in the camp, and also Atalanta his sister, were slain[1].

By the death of Perdikkas, and the defection of his soldiers, complete preponderance was thrown into the hands of Antipater, Ptolemy, and Antigonus. Antipater was invited to join the army, now consisting of the forces both of Ptolemy and Perdikkas united. He was there invested with the guardianship of the persons of the kings, and with the sort of ministerial supremacy previously held by Perdikkas. He was however exposed to much difficulty, and even to great personal danger, from the intrigues of the princess Eurydikê, who displayed a masculine boldness in publicly haranguing the soldiers—and from the discontents of the army, who claimed presents, formerly promised to them by Alexander, which there were no funds to liquidate at the moment. At Triparadisus in Syria, Antipater made a second distribution of the satrapies

[1] Plutarch, Eumenes, 8; Cornel. Nepos, Eumenes, 4; Diodor. xviii. 36, 37.

of the empire; somewhat modified, yet coinciding in the main with that which had been drawn up shortly after the death of Alexander. To Ptolemy was assured Egypt and Libya,—to Antigonus, the Greater Phrygia, Lykia, and Pamphylia—as each had had before[1].

War between Antigonus and Eumenes in Asia. Energy and ability of Eumenes. He is worsted, and blocked up in Nora.

Antigonus was placed in command of the principal Macedonian army in Asia, to crush Eumenes and the other chief adherents of Perdikkas; most of whom had been condemned to death by a vote of the Macedonian army. After a certain interval, Antipater himself, accompanied by the kings, returned to Macedonia, having eluded by artifice a renewed demand on the part of his soldiers for the promised presents. The war of Antigonus, first against Eumenes in Kappadokia, next against Alketas and the other partisans of Perdikkas in Pisidia, lasted for many months, but was at length successfully finished[2]. Eumenes, beset by the constant treachery and insubordination of the Macedonians, was defeated and driven out of the field. He took refuge with a handful of men in the impregnable and well-stored fortress of Nora in Kappadokia, where he held out a long blockade, apparently more than a year, against Antigonus[3].

B.C. 319-318.

Before the prolonged blockade of Nora had been brought to a close, Antipater, being of very advanced age, fell into sickness, and presently died. One of his latest acts was, to put to death the Athenian

[1] Diodor. xviii. 39. Arrian, ap. Photium.

[2] Arrian, De Rebus post Alexandr. lib. ix. 10. ap. Photium, Cod. 92; Diodor. xviii. 39, 40, 46; Plutarch, Eumenes, 3, 4.

[3] Plutarch, Eumenes, 10, 11; Cornel. Nepos, Eumenes, c. 5; Diodor. xviii. 41.

Sickness and death of Antipater. The Athenian orator Demades is put to death in Macedonia.

orator Demades, who had been sent to Macedonia as envoy to solicit the removal of the Macedonian garrison at Munychia. Antipater had promised, or given hopes, that if the oligarchy which he had constituted at Athens maintained unshaken adherence to Macedonia, he would withdraw the garrison. The Athenians endeavoured to prevail on Phokion to go to Macedonia as solicitor for the fulfilment of this promise; but he steadily refused. Demades, who willingly undertook the mission, reached Macedonia at a moment very untoward for himself. The papers of the deceased Perdikkas had come into possession of his opponents; and among them had been found a letter written to him by Demades, inviting him to cross over and rescue Greece from her dependence "on an old and rotten warp"—meaning Antipater. This letter gave great offence to Antipater—the rather, as Demades is said to have been his habitual pensioner—and still greater offence to his son Kassander; who caused Demades with his son to be seized—first killed the son in the immediate presence and even embrace of the father—and then slew the father himself, with bitter invective against his ingratitude[1]. All the accounts which we read depict Demades, in general terms,

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 30; Diodor. xviii. 48; Plutarch, Demosth. 31; Arrian, De Reb. post Alex. vi. ap. Photium, Cod. 92.

In the life of Phokion, Plutarch has written inadvertently *Antigonus* instead of *Perdikkas*.

It is not easy to see, however, how Deinarchus can have been the accuser of Demades on such a matter—as Arrian and Plutarch state. Arrian seems to put the death of Demades too early, from his anxiety to bring it into immediate juxtaposition with the death of Demosthenes, whose condemnation Demades had proposed in the Athenian assembly.

as a prodigal spendthrift and a venal and corrupt politician. We have no ground for questioning this statement: at the same time, we have no specific facts to prove it.

B.C. 318.

Antipater sets aside his son Kassander, and names Polysperchon viceroy. Discontent and opposition of Kassander.

Antipater by his last directions appointed Polysperchon, one of Alexander's veteran officers, to be chief administrator, with full powers on behalf of the imperial dynasty; while he assigned to his own son Kassander only the second place, as Chiliarch or general of the body-guard[1]. He thought that this disposition of power would be more generally acceptable throughout the empire, as Polysperchon was older and of longer military service than any other among Alexander's generals. Moreover, Antipater was especially afraid of letting dominion fall into the hands of the princesses[2]; all of whom —Olympias, Kleopatra, and Eurydikê—were energetic characters; and the first of the three (who had retired to Epirus from enmity towards Antipater) furious and implacable.

Kassander sets up for himself, gets possession of Munychia, and forms alliance with Ptolemy and Antigonus against Polysperchon.

But the views of Antipater were disappointed from the beginning, because Kassander would not submit to the second place, nor tolerate Polysperchon as his superior. Immediately after the death of Antipater, but before it became publicly known, Kassander despatched Nikanor with pretended orders from Antipater to supersede Menyllus in the government of Munychia. To this order Menyllus yielded. But when after a few days the Athenian public came to learn the real truth, they were displeased with Phokion for having permitted the change to be made—assuming that he knew the

[1] Diod. xviii. 48.

[2] Diod. xix. 11.

real state of the facts, and might have kept out the new commander[1]. Kassander, while securing this important post in the hands of a confirmed partisan, affected to acquiesce in the authority of Polysperchon, and to occupy himself with a hunting-party in the country. He at the same time sent confidential adherents to the Hellespont and other places in furtherance of his schemes; and especially to contract alliance with Antigonus in Asia and with Ptolemy in Egypt. His envoys being generally well received, he himself soon quitted Macedonia suddenly, and went to concert measures with Antigonus in Asia[2]. It suited the policy of Ptolemy, and still more that of Antigonus, to aid him against Polysperchon and the imperial dynasty. On the death of Antipater, Antigonus had resolved to make himself the real sovereign of the Asiatic Alexandrine empire, possessing as he did the most powerful military force within it.

B.C. 318–317. Plans of Polysperchon—alliance with Olympias in Europe, and with Eumenes in Asia—enfranchisement of the Grecian cities.

Even before this time the imperial dynasty had been a name rather than a reality; yet still a respected name. But now, the preference shown to Polysperchon by the deceased Antipater, and the secession of Kassander, placed all the great real powers in active hostility against the dynasty. Polysperchon and his friends were not blind to the difficulties of their position. The principal officers in Macedonia having been convened to deliberate, it was resolved to invite Olympias out of Epirus, that she might assume the tutelage of her grandson

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 31. Diodorus (xviii. 64) says also that Nikanor was nominated by Kassander.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 54.

Alexander (son of Roxana)—to place the Asiatic interests of the dynasty in the hands of Eumenes, appointing him to the supreme command[1]—and to combat Kassander in Europe, by assuring to themselves the general goodwill and support of the Greeks. This last object was to be obtained by granting to the Greeks general enfranchisement, and by subverting the Antipatrian oligarchies and military governments now paramount throughout the cities.

Ineffectual attempts of Eumenes to uphold the imperial dynasty in Asia: his gallantry and ability: he is betrayed by his own soldiers, and slain by Antigonus.

The last hope of maintaining the unity of Alexander's empire in Asia, against the counter-interests of the great Macedonian officers, who were steadily tending to divide and appropriate it—now lay in the fidelity and military skill of Eumenes. At his disposal Polysperchon placed the imperial treasures and soldiers in Asia; especially the brave, but faithless and disorderly, Argyraspides. Olympias also addressed to him a pathetic letter, asking his counsel as the only friend and saviour to whom the imperial family could now look. Eumenes replied by assuring them of his devoted adherence to their cause. But he at the same time advised Olympias not to come out of Epirus into Macedonia; or if she did come, at all events to abstain from vindictive and cruel proceedings. Both these recommendations, honourable as well to his prudence as to his humanity, were disregarded by the old queen. She came into Macedonia to take the management of affairs; and although her imposing title, of mother to the great conqueror, raised a strong favourable feeling, yet her multiplied executions

[1] Diodor. xviii. 49-58.

of the Antipatrian partisans excited fatal enmity against a dynasty already tottering. Nevertheless Eumenes, though his advice had been disregarded, devoted himself in Asia with unshaken fidelity to the Alexandrine family, resisting the most tempting invitations to take part with Antigonus against them[1]. His example contributed much to keep alive the same active sentiment in those around him; indeed, without him, the imperial family would have had no sincere or commanding representative in Asia. His gallant struggles, first in Kilikia and Phenicia, next (when driven from the coast), in Susiana, Persis, Media, and Parætakênê—continued for two years against the greatly preponderant forces of Ptolemy, Antigonus, and Seleukus, and against the never-ceasing treachery of his own officers and

[1] Plutarch, Eumenes, 11, 12; Cornelius Nepos, Eumenes, c. 6; Diodor. xviii. 58-62.

Diodor. xvii. 58. ἦκε δὲ καὶ παρ' Ὀλυμπιάδος αὐτῷ γράμματα, δεομένης καὶ λιπαρούσης βοηθεῖν τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καὶ ἑαυτῇ· μόνον γὰρ ἐκεῖνον πιστότατον ἀπολελεῖφθαι τῶν φίλων, καὶ δυνάμενον διορθώσασθαι τὴν ἐρημίαν τῆς βασιλικῆς οἰκίας.

Cornelius Nepos, Eumenes, 6. "Ad hunc (Eumenem) Olympias, quum literas et nuntios misisset in Asiam, consultum, utrum repetitum Macedoniam veniret (nam tum in Epiro habitabat) et eas res occuparet —huic ille primum suasit ne se moveret, et expectaret quoad Alexandri filius regnum adipisceretur. Sin aliquâ cupiditate raperetur in Macedoniam, omnium injuriarum oblivisceretur, et in neminem acerbiore uteretur imperio. Horum illa nihil fecit. Nam et in Macedoniam profecta est, et ibi crudelissime se gessit." Compare Justin, xiv. 6; Diodor. xix. 11.

The details respecting Eumenes may be considered probably as depending on unusually good authority. His friend Hieronymus of Kardia had written a copious history of his own time; which, though now lost, was accessible both to Diodorus and Plutarch. Hieronymus was serving with Eumenes, and was taken prisoner along with him by Antigonus; who spared him and treated him well, while Eumenes was put to death (Diodor. xix. 44). Plutarch had also read letters of Eumenes (Plut. Eum. 11).

troops[1]—do not belong to Grecian history. They are however among the most memorable exploits of antiquity. While even in a military point of view, they are hardly inferior to the combinations of Alexander himself—they evince, besides, a flexibility and aptitude such as Alexander neither possessed nor required, for overcoming the thousand difficulties raised by traitors and mutineers around him. To the last, Eumenes remained unsubdued; he was betrayed to Antigonus by the base and venal treachery of his own soldiers, the Macedonian Argyraspides[2].

For the interests of the imperial dynasty (the extinction of which we shall presently follow), it is perhaps to be regretted that they did not abandon Asia at once, at the death of Antipater, and concentrate their attention on Macedonia alone, summoning over Eumenes to aid them. To keep together in unity the vast aggregate of Asia was manifestly impracticable, even with his consummate ability. Indeed we read that Olympias wished for his presence in Europe, not trusting any one but him as protector of the child Alexander[3]. In Macedonia, apart from Asia, Eumenes, if the violent temper of Olympias had permitted him, might have

[1] Diodor. xviii. 63-72; xix. 11, 17, 32, 44.

[2] Plutarch (Eumenes, 16-18), Cornelius Nepos (10-13), and Justin (xiv. 3, 4) describe in considerable detail the touching circumstances attending the tradition and capture of Eumenes. On this point Diodorus is more brief; but he recounts at much length the preceding military operations between Eumenes and Antigonus (xix. 17, 32, 44).

The original source of these particulars must probably be, the history of Hieronymus of Kardia, himself present, and copied, more or less accurately, by others.

[3] Plutarch, Eumenes, 13; Diodor. xviii. 58.

upheld the dynasty; which, having at that time a decided interest in conciliating the Greeks, might probably have sanctioned his sympathies in favour of free Hellenic community[1].

Edict issued by Polysperchon at Pella, in the name of the imperial dynasty—subverting the Antipatrian oligarchies in the Grecian cities, restoring political exiles, and granting free constitutions to each.

On learning the death of Antipater, most of the Greek cities had sent envoys to Pella[2]. To all the governments of these cities, composed as they were of his creatures, it was a matter of the utmost moment to know what course the new Macedonian authority would adopt. Polysperchon, persuaded that they would all adhere to Kassander, and that his only chance of combating that rival was by enlisting popular sympathy and interests in Greece, or at least by subverting these Antipatrian oligarchies—drew up in conjunction with his counsellors a proclamation which he issued in the name of the dynasty.

After reciting the steady goodwill of Philip and Alexander towards Greece, he affirmed that this feeling had been interrupted by the untoward Lamian war, originating with some ill-judged Greeks, and ending in the infliction of many severe calamities upon the various cities. But all these severities (he continued) had proceeded from the generals (Antipater and Kraterus): the kings were now determined to redress them. It was accordingly proclaimed that the political constitution of each city should be restored, as it had stood in the times of Philip and Alexander; that before the thirtieth of the month Xanthikus, all those who

[1] Plutarch, Eumenes, 3.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 55. *εὐθὺς οὖν τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων παρόντας πρεσβευτὰς προσκαλεσάμενοι*, &c.

had been condemned to banishment, or deported, by the generals, should be recalled and received back; that their properties should be restored, and past-sentences against them rescinded; that they should live in amnesty as to the past, and good feeling as to the future, with the remaining citizens. From this act of recall were excluded, the exiles of Amphissa, Trikka, Pharkadon, and Herakleia, together with a certain number of Megalopolitans, implicated in one particular conspiracy. In the particular case of those cities, the governments of which had been denounced as hostile by Philip or Alexander, special reference and consultation was opened with Pella, for some modification to meet the circumstances. As to Athens, it was decreed that Samos should be restored to her, but not Orôpus; in all other respects, she was placed on the same footing as in the days of Philip and Alexander. "All the Greeks (concluded this proclamation) shall pass decrees, forbidding every one either to bear arms or otherwise act in hostility against us—on pain of exile and confiscation of goods, for himself and his family. On this and on all other matters, we have ordered Polysperchon to take proper measures. Obey him—as we have before written to you to *do*; for we shall not omit to notice those who on any point disregard our proclamation[1]."

[1] Diodor. xviii. 56. In this chapter the proclamation is given *verbatim*. For the exceptions made in respect to Amphissa, Trikka, Herakleia, &c., we do not know the grounds.

Reference is made to prior edicts of the kings—ὑμεῖς οὖν, καθάπερ ὑμῖν καὶ πρότερον ἐγράψαμεν, ἀκούετε τούτου (Πολυσπέρχοντος). These words must allude to written answers given to particular cities, in reply

Letters and measures of Polysperchon to enforce the edict. State of Athens: exiles returning: complicated political parties: danger of Phokion.

Such was the new edict issued by the kings, or rather by Polysperchon in their names. It directed the removal of all the garrisons, and the subversion of all the oligarchies, established by Antipater after the Lamian war. It ordered the recall of the host of exiles then expelled. It revived the state of things prevalent before the death of Alexander—which indeed itself had been, for the most part, an aggregate of macedonizing oligarchies interspersed with Macedonian garrisons. To the existing Antipatrian oligarchies, however, it was a deathblow; and so it must have been understood by the Grecian envoys—including probably deputations from the exiles, as well as envoys from the civic governments—to whom Polysperchon delivered it at Pella. Not content with the general edict, Polysperchon addressed special letters to Argos and various other cities, commanding that the Antipatrian leading men should be banished with confiscation of property, and in some cases put to death[1]; the names being probably furnished to him by the exiles. Lastly, as it was clear that such stringent measures could not be executed without force,—the rather as these oligarchies would be upheld by Kassander from without—Polysperchon resolved to conduct a large military force into Greece; sending thither first, however, a considerable detachment, for immediate operations, under his son Alexander.

To Athens, as well as to other cities, Polysperchon addressed special letters, promising restoration

to special applications. No general proclamation, earlier than this, can have been issued since the death of Antipater.

[1] Diod. xviii. 57.

of the democracy and recall of the exiles. At Athens, such change was a greater revolution than elsewhere, because the multitude of exiles and persons deported had been the greatest. To the existing nine thousand Athenian citizens, it was doubtless odious and alarming; while to Phokion with the other leading Antipatrians, it threatened not only loss of power, but probably nothing less than the alternative of flight or death[1]. The state of interests at Athens, however, was now singularly novel and complicated. There were the Antipatrians and the nine thousand qualified citizens. There were the exiles, who, under the new edict, speedily began re-entering the city, and reclaiming their citizenship as well as their properties. Polysperchon and his son were known to be soon coming with a powerful force. Lastly, there was Nikanor, who held Munychia with a garrison, neither for Polysperchon, nor for the Athenians, but for Kassander; the latter being himself also expected with a force from Asia. Here then were several parties; each distinct in views and interests from the rest—some decidedly hostile to each other.

Negotiations of the Athenians with Nikanor, governor of Munychia for Kassander.

The first contest arose between the Athenians and Nikanor respecting Munychia; which they required him to evacuate, pursuant to the recent proclamation. Nikanor on his side returned an evasive answer, promising compliance as soon as circum-

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 32. The opinion of Plutarch, however, that Polysperchon intended this measure as a mere trick to ruin Phokion, is only correct so far—that Polysperchon wished to put down the Antipatrian oligarchies everywhere, and that Phokion was the leading person of that oligarchy at Athens.

stances permitted, but in the mean time entreating the Athenians to continue in alliance with Kassander, as they had been with his father Antipater[1]. He seems to have indulged hopes of prevailing on them to declare in his favour—and not without plausible grounds, since the Antipatrian leaders and a large proportion of the nine thousand citizens could not but dread the execution of Polysperchon's edict. And he had also what was of still greater moment —the secret connivance and support of Phokion: who put himself in intimate relation with Nikanor, as he had before done with Menyllus[2]—and who had greater reason than any one else to dread the edict of Polysperchon. At a public assembly held in Peiræus to discuss the subject, Nikanor even ventured to present himself in person, in the company and under the introduction of Phokion, who was anxious that the Athenians should entertain the proposition of alliance with Kassander. But with the people, the prominent wish was to get rid altogether of the foreign garrison, and to procure the evacuation of Munychia—for which object, of course, the returned exiles would be even more anxious than the nine thousand. Accordingly, the assembly refused to hear any propositions from Nikanor; while Derkyllus with others even proposed to seize his person. It was Phokion who ensured to him the means of escaping; even in spite of serious wrath from his fellow-citizens, to whom he pleaded, that he had made himself guarantee for Nikanor's personal safety[3].

[1] Diodor. xviii. 64.

[2] Plutarch, Phokion, 31.

[3] Plutarch, Phokion, 32.

Nikanor seizes Peiræus by surprise. Phokion, though forewarned, takes no precautions against it.

Foreseeing the gravity of the impending contest, Nikanor had been secretly introducing fresh soldiers into Munychia. And when he found that he could not obtain any declared support from the Athenians, he laid a scheme for surprising and occupying the town and harbour of Peiræus, of which Munychia formed the adjoining eminence and harbour, on the southern side of the little peninsula. Notwithstanding all his precautions, it became known to various Athenians that he was tampering with persons in Peiræus, and collecting troops in the neighbouring isle of Salamis. So much anxiety was expressed in the Athenian assembly for the safety of Peiræus, that a decree was passed, enjoining all citizens to hold themselves in arms for its protection, under Phokion as general. Nevertheless Phokion, disregarding such a decree, took no precautions, affirming that he would himself be answerable for Nikanor. Presently that officer, making an unexpected attack from Munychia and Salamis, took Peiræus by surprise, placed both the town and harbour under military occupation, and cut off its communication with Athens by a ditch and palisade. On this palpable aggression, the Athenians rushed to arms. But Phokion as general damped their ardour, and even declined to head them in an attack for the recovery of Peiræus before Nikanor should have had time to strengthen himself in it. He went however, with Konon (son of Timotheus), to remonstrate with Nikanor, and to renew the demand that he should evacuate, under the recent proclamation, all the posts which he held in garrison. But Nikanor would give no other answer, except that he held his com-

mission from Kassander, to whom they must address their application[1]. He thus again tried to bring Athens into communication with Kassander.

Mischief to the Athenians, as well as to Polysperchon, from Nikanor's occupation of Peiræus; culpable negligence, and probable collusion, of Phokion.

The occupation of Peiræus in addition to Munychia was a serious calamity to the Athenians, making them worse off than they had been even under Antipater. Peiræus, rich, active, and commercial, containing the Athenian arsenal, docks, and muniments of war, was in many respects more valuable than Athens itself; for all purposes of war, far more valuable. Kassander had now an excellent place of arms and base, which Munychia alone would not have afforded, for his operations in Greece against Polysperchon; upon whom therefore the loss fell hardly less severely than upon the Athenians. Now Phokion, in his function as general, had been forewarned of the danger, might have guarded against it, and ought to have done so. This was a grave dereliction of duty, and admits of hardly any other explanation except that of treasonable connivance. It seems that Phokion, foreseeing his own ruin and that of his friends in the triumph of Polysperchon and the return of the exiles, was desirous of favouring the seizure of Peiræus by Nikanor, as a means of constraining Athens to adopt the alliance with Kassander; which alliance indeed would probably have been brought about, had Kassander reached Peiræus by sea sooner than the first troops of Polysperchon by land. Phokion was here guilty, at the very least, of culpable neglect, and probably of still more culpable treason, on an occasion seriously

[1] Diodor. xviii. 64; Plutarch, Phokion, 32; Cornelius Nepos, Phokion, 2.

injuring both Polysperchon and the Athenians; a fact which we must not forget, when we come to read presently the bitter animosity exhibited against him[1].

Arrival of Alexander (son of Polysperchon): his treacherous policy to the Athenians; Kassander reaches Peiræus.

The news, that Nikanor had possessed himself of Peiræus, produced a strong sensation. Presently arrived a letter addressed to him by Olympias herself, commanding him to surrender the place to the Athenians, upon whom she wished to confer entire autonomy. But Nikanor declined obedience to her order, still waiting for support from Kassander. The arrival of Alexander (Polysperchon's son) with a body of troops, encouraged the Athenians to believe that he was come to assist in carrying Peiræus by force, for the purpose of restoring it to them. Their hopes however were again disappointed. Though encamped near Peiræus, Alexander made no demand for the Athenian forces to co-operate with him in attacking it; but entered into open parley with Nikanor, whom he endeavoured to persuade or corrupt into surrendering the place[2]. When this negotiation failed, he resolved to wait for the arrival of his father, who was already on his march towards Attica with the main army. His own force unassisted was probably not sufficient to attack Peiræus; nor did

[1] Cornelius Nepos, Phocion, 2. "Concidit autem maxime uno crimine: quod cum apud eum summum esset imperium populi, et Nicanorem, Cassandri præfectum, insidiari Piræo Atheniensium, a Dercyllo moneretur: idemque postularet, ut provideret, ne commeatibus civitas privaretur—huic, audiente populo, Phocion negavit esse periculum, seque ejus rei obsidem fore pollicitus est. Neque ita multo post Nicanor Piræo est potitus. Ad quem recuperandum cum populus armatus concurrisset, ille non modo neminem ad arma vocavit, sed ne armatis quidem præesse voluit, sine quo Athenæ omnino esse non possunt."

[2] Diodor. xviii. 65; Plutarch, Phokion, 33.

he choose to invoke assistance from the Athenians, to whom he would then have been compelled to make over the place when taken, which they so ardently desired. The Athenians were thus as far from their object as ever; moreover, by this delay the opportunity of attacking the place was altogether thrown away; for Kassander with his armament reached it before Polysperchon.

Intrigues of Phokion with Alexander—he tries to secure for himself the protection of Alexander against the Athenians.

It was Phokion and his immediate colleagues who induced Alexander to adopt this insidious policy; to decline reconquering Peiræus for the Athenians, and to appropriate it for himself. To Phokion, the reconstitution of autonomous Athens, with its democracy and restored exiles, and without any foreign controling force — was an assured sentence of banishment, if not of death. Not having been able to obtain protection from the foreign force of Nikanor and Kassander, he and his friends resolved to throw themselves upon that of Alexander and Polysperchon. They went to meet Alexander as he entered Attica—represented the impolicy of his relinquishing so important a military position as Peiræus, while the war was yet unfinished,—and offered to co-operate with him for this purpose, by proper management of the Athenian public. Alexander was pleased with these suggestions, accepted Phokion with the others as his leading adherents at Athens, and looked upon Peiræus as a capture to be secured for himself[1]. Numerous returning

[1] Diodor. xviii. 65. Τῶν γὰρ Ἀντιπάτρῳ γεγονότων φίλων τινὲς (ὑπῆρχον) καὶ οἱ περὶ Φωκίωνα φοβούμενοι τὰς ἐκ τῶν νόμων τιμωρίας, ὑπήντησαν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, καὶ διδάξαντες τὸ σύμφερον, ἔπεισαν αὐτὸν ἰδίᾳ κατέχειν τὰ φρούρια, καὶ μὴ παραδιδόναι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, μέχρις ἂν ὁ Κάσσανδρος καταπολεμήθη.

Athenian exiles accompanied Alexander's army. It seems that Phokion was desirous of admitting the troops, along with the exiles, as friends and allies into the walls of Athens, so as to make Alexander master of the city—but that this project was impracticable, in consequence of the mistrust created among the Athenians by the parleys of Alexander with Nikanor[1].

Return of the deported exiles to Athens—public vote passed in the Athenian assembly against Phokion and his colleagues. Phokion leaves the city, is protected by Alexander, and goes to meet Polysperchon in Phokis.

The strategic function of Phokion, however, so often conferred and re-conferred upon him—and his power of doing either good or evil—now approached its close. As soon as the returning exiles found themselves in sufficient numbers, they called for a revision of the list of state-officers, and for the re-establishment of the democratical forms. They passed a vote to depose those who had held office under the Antipatrian obligarchy, and who still continued to hold it down to the actual moment. Among these Phokion stood first: along with him were his son-in-law Charikles, the Phalerean Demetrius, Kallimedon, Nikokles, Thudippus, Hegemon, and Philokles. These persons were not only deposed, but condemned, some to death, some to banishment and confiscation of property. Demetrius, Charikles, and Kallimedon sought safety by leaving Attica;

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 33; Diod. xviii. 65, 66. This seems to me the probable sequence of facts, combining Plutarch with Diodorus. Plutarch takes no notice of the negotiation opened by Phokion with Alexander, and the understanding established between them; which is stated in the clearest manner by Diodorus, and appears to me a material circumstance. On the other hand, Plutarch mentions (though Diodorus does not) that Alexander was anxious to seize Athens itself, and was very near succeeding. Plutarch seems to conceive that it was the exiles who were disposed to let him in; but if that had been the case, he probably would have been let in when the exiles became preponderant. It was Phokion, I conceive, who was desirous, for his own personal safety, of admitting the foreign troops.

but Phokion and the rest merely went to Alexander's camp, throwing themselves upon his protection on the faith of the recent understanding[1]. Alexander not only received them courteously, but gave them letters to his father Polysperchon, requesting safety and protection for them, as men who had embraced his cause, and who were still eager to do all in their power to support him[2]. Armed with these letters, Phokion and his companions went through Bœotia and Phokis to meet Polysperchon on his march southward. They were accompanied by Deinarchus and by a Platæan named Solon, both of them passing for friends of Polysperchon[3].

Agnonides and others are sent as deputies to Polysperchon, to accuse Phokion, and to claim the benefit of the regal edict.

The Athenian democracy, just reconstituted, which had passed the recent condemnatory votes, was disquieted at the news that Alexander had espoused the cause of Phokion and had recommended the like policy to his father. It was possible that Polysperchon might seek, with his powerful army, both to occupy Athens and to capture Peiræus, and might avail himself of Phokion (like Antipater after the Lamian war) as a convenient instrument of government. It seems plain that this was the project of Alexander, and that he counted on Phokion as a ready auxiliary in both. Now the restored democrats, though owing their

[1] Diodor. xviii. 65; Plutarch, Phokion, 35.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 66. *Προσδεχθέντες δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* (Alexander) *φιλοφρόνως, γράμματα ἔλαβον πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Πολυσπέρχοντα, ὅπως μηδὲν πάθωσιν οἱ περὶ Φωκίωνα τἀκείνου πεφρονηκότες, καὶ νῦν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι πάντα συμπράξειν.*

This application of Phokion to Alexander, and the letters obtained to Polysperchon, are not mentioned by Plutarch, though they are important circumstances in following the last days of Phokion's life.

[3] Plutarch, Phokion, 33.

restoration to Polysperchon, were much less compliant towards him than Phokion had been. Not only they would not admit him into the city, but they would not even acquiesce in his separate occupation of Munychia and Peiræus. On the proposition of Agnonides and Archestratus, they sent a deputation to Polysperchon accusing Phokion and his comrades of high treason; yet at the same time claiming for Athens the full and undiminished benefit of the late regal proclamation—autonomy and democracy, with restoration of Peiræus and Munychia free and ungarrisoned[1].

Agnonides and Phokion are heard before Polysperchon—Phokion and his colleagues are delivered up as prisoners to the Athenians.

The deputation reached Polysperchon at Pharyges in Phokis, as early as Phokion's company, which had been detained for some days at Elateia by the sickness of Deinarchus. That delay was unfortunate for Phokion. Had he seen Polysperchon, and presented the letter of Alexander, before the Athenian accusers arrived, he might probably have obtained a more favourable reception. But as the arrival of the two parties was nearly simultaneous, Polysperchon heard both of them at the same audience, before King Philip Aridæus in his throne with the gilt ceiling above it. When Agnonides,—chief of the Athenian deputation, and formerly friend and advocate of Demosthenes in the Harpalian cause—found himself face to face with Phokion and his friends, their reciprocal invectives at first produced nothing but confusion; until Agnonides himself exclaimed—"Pack us all into one cage and send us back to Athens to receive

[1] Diodor. xviii. 66.

judgment from the Athenians." The king laughed at this observation, but the bystanders around insisted upon more orderly proceedings, and Agnonides then set forth the two demands of the Athenians—condemnation of Phokion and his friends, partly as accomplices of Antipater, partly as having betrayed Peiræus to Nikanor—and the full benefit of the late regal proclamation to Athens[1]. Now, on the last of these two heads, Polysperchon was noway disposed to yield—nor to hand over Peiræus to the Athenians as soon as he should take it. On this matter, accordingly, he replied by refusal or evasion. But he was all the more disposed to satisfy the Athenians on the other matter—the surrender of Phokion; especially as the sentiment now prevalent at Athens evinced clearly that Phokion could not be again useful to him as an instrument. Thus disposed to sacrifice Phokion, Polysperchon heard his defence with impatience, interrupted him several times, and so disgusted him, that he at length struck the ground with his stick, and held his peace. Hegemon,

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 33; Cornel. Nepos, Phokion, 3. "Hic (Phocion), ab Agnonide accusatus, quod Piræum Nicanori prodidisset, ex consilii sententiâ, in custodiam conjectus, Athenas deductus est, ut ibi de eo legibus fieret judicium."

Plutarch says that Polysperchon, before he gave this hearing to both parties, ordered *the Corinthian Deinarchus* to be tortured and to be put to death. Now the person so named cannot be Deinarchus, the logographer—of whom we have some specimens remaining, and who was alive even as late as 292 B.C.—though he too was a Corinthian. Either, therefore, there were two Corinthians, both bearing this same name (as Westermann supposes—Gesch. der Beredtsamkeit, sect. 72), or the statement of Plutarch must allude to an order given but not carried into effect—which latter seems to me most probable.

another of the accused, was yet more harshly treated. When he appealed to Polysperchon himself, as having been personally cognizant of his (the speaker's) good dispositions towards the Athenian people (he had been probably sent to Pella, as envoy for redress of grievances under the Antipatrian oligarchy), Polysperchon exclaimed—"Do not utter falsehoods against me before the king." Moreover, king Philip himself was so incensed, as to start from his throne and snatch his spear; with which he would have run Hegemon through,—imitating the worst impulses of his illustrious brother—had he not been held back by Polysperchon. The sentence could not be doubtful. Phokion and his companions were delivered over as prisoners to the Athenian deputation, together with a letter from the king, intimating that in his conviction they were traitors, but that he left them to be judged by the Athenians, now restored to freedom and autonomy[1].

Phokion is conveyed as prisoner to Athens, and brought for trial before the assembly. Motion of his friends for exclusion of non-qualified persons.

The Macedonian Kleitus was instructed to convey them to Athens as prisoners under a guard. Mournful was the spectacle as they entered the city; being carried along the Kerameikus in carts, through sympathising friends and an embittered multitude, until they reached the theatre, wherein the assembly was to be convened. That assembly was composed of every one who chose to enter, and is said to have contained many foreigners and slaves. But it would have been fortunate for Phokion had such really been the case; for foreigners and slaves had no cause of antipathy towards him.

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 33, 34; Diodor. xviii. 66.

The assembly was mainly composed of Phokion's keenest enemies, the citizens just returned from exile or deportation; among whom may doubtless have been intermixed more or less of non-qualified persons, since the lists had probably not yet been verified. When the assembly was about to be opened, the friends of Phokion moved, that on occasion of so important a trial, foreigners and slaves should be sent away. This was in every sense an impolitic proceeding; for the restored exiles, chiefly poor men, took it as an insult to themselves, and became only the more embittered, exclaiming against the oligarchs who were trying to exclude them.

Intense exasperation of the returned exiles against Phokion—grounds for that feeling.

It is not easy to conceive stronger grounds of exasperation than those which inflamed the bosoms of these returned exiles. We must recollect that at the close of the Lamian war, the Athenian democracy had been forcibly subverted. Demosthenes and its principal leaders had been slain, some of them with antecedent cruelties; the poorer multitude, in number more than half of the qualified citizens, had been banished or deported into distant regions. To all the public shame and calamity, there was thus superadded a vast mass of individual suffering and impoverishment, the mischiefs of which were very imperfectly healed, even by that unexpected contingency which had again thrown open to them their native city. Accordingly, when these men returned from different regions, each hearing from the rest new tales of past hardship, they felt the bitterest hatred against the authors of the Antipatrian revolution; and among

these authors Phokion stood distinctly marked. For although he had neither originated nor advised these severities, yet he and his friends, as administering the Antipatrian government at Athens, must have been agents in carrying them out, and had rendered themselves distinctly liable to the fearful penalties pronounced by the psephism of Demophantus[1], consecrated by an oath taken by Athenians generally, against any one who should hold an official post after the government was subverted.

Phokion is condemned to death —vindictive manifestation against him in the assembly, furious and unanimous.

When these restored citizens thus saw Phokion brought before them, for the first time after their return, the common feeling of antipathy against him burst out in furious manifestations. Agnonides the principal accuser, supported by Epikurus[2] and Demophilus, found their denunciations welcomed and even anticipated, when they arraigned Phokion as a criminal who had lent his hand to the subversion of the constitution,—to the sufferings of his deported fellow-citizens,—and to the holding of Athens in subjection under a foreign potentate; in addition to which, the betrayal of Peiræus to Nikanor[3] constituted a new crime; fastening on the people the yoke of Kassander, when autonomy had been promised to them by the recent imperial edict. After the accusation was concluded, Phokion was called on for his defence; but he found it impossible to obtain a hearing.

[1] Andokides de Mysteriis, sect. 96, 97; Lykurgus adv. Leokrat. s. 127.

[2] *Not* the eminent philosopher so named.

[3] Cornel. Nepos, Phoc. 4. "Plurimi vero ita exacuerentur propter proditionis suspicionem Piræi, maximeque quod adversus populi commoda in senectute steterat."

Attempting several times to speak, he was as often interrupted by angry shouts; several of his friends were cried down in like manner; until at length he gave up the case in despair, and exclaimed, "For myself, Athenians, I plead guilty; I pronounce against myself the sentence of death for my political conduct; but why are you to sentence these men near me, who are not guilty?" "Because they are your friends, Phokion"—was the exclamation of those around. Phokion then said no more; while Agnonides proposed a decree, to the effect, that the assembled people should decide by show of hands, whether the persons now arraigned were guilty or not; and that if declared guilty, they should be put to death. Some persons present cried out, that the penalty of torture ought to precede death; but this savage proposition, utterly at variance with Athenian law in respect to citizens, was repudiated not less by Agnonides than by the Macedonian officer Kleitus. The decree was then passed; after which the show of hands was called for. Nearly every hand in the assembly was held up in condemnation; each man even rose from his seat to make the effect more imposing; and some went so far as to put on wreaths in token of triumph. To many of them doubtless, the gratification of this intense and unanimous vindictive impulse,—in their view not merely legitimate, but patriotic,—must have been among the happiest moments of life[1].

After sentence, the five condemned persons,

[1] Diodor. xviii. 66, 67; Plutarch, Phokion, 34, 35; Cornelius Nepos, Phokion, 2, 3.

Death of Phokion and his four colleagues.

Phokion, Nikokles, Thudippus, Hegemon, and Pythokles, were consigned to the supreme magistrates of Police, called The Eleven, and led to prison for the purpose of having the customary dose of poison administered. Hostile bystanders ran alongside, taunting and reviling them. It is even said that one man planted himself in the front, and spat upon Phokion; who turned to the public officers and exclaimed—"Will no one check this indecent fellow?" This was the only emotion which he manifested; in other respects, his tranquillity and self-possession were resolutely maintained, during this soul-subduing march from the theatre to the prison, amidst the wailings of his friends, the broken spirit of his four comrades, and the fiercest demonstrations of antipathy from his fellow-citizens generally. One ray of comfort presented itself as he entered the prison. It was the nineteenth of the month Munychion, the day on which the Athenian Horsemen or Knights (the richest class in the city, men for the most part of oligarchical sentiments) celebrated their festal procession with wreaths on their heads in honour of Zeus. Several of these horsemen halted in passing, took off their wreaths, and wept as they looked through the gratings of the prison.

Being asked whether he had anything to tell his son Phokus, Phokion replied—"I tell him emphatically, not to hold evil memory of the Athenians." The draught of hemlock was then administered to all five—to Phokion last. Having been condemned for treason, they were not buried in Attica; nor were Phokion's friends allowed to light a funeral pile for

the burning of his body; which was carried out of Attica into the Megarid, by a hired agent named Konopion, and there burnt by fire obtained at Megara. The wife of Phokion, with her maids, poured libations and marked the spot by a small mound of earth; she also collected the bones and brought them back to Athens in her bosom, during the secrecy of night. She buried them near her own domestic hearth, with this address—"Beloved Hestia, I confide to thee these relics of a good man. Restore them to his own family vault, as soon as the Athenians shall come to their senses[1]."

After a short time (we are told by Plutarch) the

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 36, 37. Two other anecdotes are recounted by Plutarch, which seem to be of doubtful authenticity. Nikokles entreated that he might be allowed to swallow his potion before Phokion; upon which the latter replied—"Your request, Nikokles, is sad and mournful; but as I have never yet refused you anything throughout my life, I grant this also."

After the four first had drunk, all except Phokion, no more hemlock was left; upon which the gaoler said that he would not prepare any more, unless twelve drachmæ of money were given to him to buy the material. Some hesitation took place, until Phokion asked one of his friends to supply the money, sarcastically remarking, that it was hard if a man could not even die *gratis* at Athens.

As to the first of these anecdotes—if we read, in Plato's Phædon (152–155), the details of the death of Sokrates,—we shall see that death by hemlock was not caused instantaneously, but in a gradual and painless manner; the person who had swallowed the potion being desired to walk about for some time, until his legs grew heavy, and then to lie down in bed, after which he gradually chilled and became insensible, first in the extremities, next in the vital centres. Under these circumstances, the question—which of the persons condemned should swallow the first of the five potions—could be of very little moment.

Then, as to the alleged niggardly stock of hemlock in the Athenian prison—what would have been the alternative, if Phokion's friend had not furnished the twelve drachmæ? Would he have remained in confinement, without being put to death? Certainly not; for he was under capital sentence. Would he have been put to death by the sword or some other unexpensive instrument? This is at variance with the

Athenians did thus come to their senses. They discovered that Phokion had been a faithful and excellent public servant, repented of their severity towards him, celebrated his funeral obsequies at the public expense, erected a statue in his honour, and put to death Agnonides by public judicial sentence; while Epikurus and Demophilus fled from the city and were slain by Phokion's son[1].

Alteration of the sentiment of the Athenians towards Phokion, not long afterwards. Honours shown to his memory.

These facts are ostensibly correct; but Plutarch omits to notice the real explanation of them. Within two or three months after the death of Phokion, Kassander, already in possession of Peiræus and Munychia, became also master of Athens; the oligarchical or Phokionic party again acquired predominance; Demetrius the Phalerean was recalled from exile, and placed to administer the city under Kassander, as Phokion had administered it under Antipater.

Explanation of this alteration. Kassander gets possession of Athens, and restores the oligarchical or Phokionic party.

No wonder, that under such circumstances, the memory of Phokion should be honoured. But this is a very different thing from spontaneous change of popular opinion respecting him. I see no reason why such change of opinion should have occurred, nor do I believe that it did occur. The Demos of Athens, banished and deported in mass, had the best ground for hating Phokion, and were

analogy of Athenian practice. If there be any truth in the story, we must suppose that the Eleven had allotted to this gaoler a stock of hemlock (or the price thereof) really adequate to five potions, but that he by accident or awkwardness had wasted a part of it, so that it would have been necessary for him to supply the deficiency out of his own pocket. From this embarrassment he was rescued by Phokion and his friend; and Phokion's sarcasm touches upon the strangeness of a man being called upon to pay for his own execution.

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 38.

not likely to become ashamed of the feeling. Though he was personally mild and incorruptible, they derived no benefit from these virtues. To them it was of little moment that he should steadily refuse all presents from Antipater, when he did Antipater's work gratuitously. Considered as a judicial trial, the last scene of Phokion before the people in the theatre is nothing better than a cruel imposture; considered as a manifestation of public opinion already settled, it is one for which the facts of the past supplied ample warrant.

Life and character of Phokion.

We cannot indeed read without painful sympathy the narrative of an old man above eighty,—personally brave, mild, and superior to all pecuniary temptation, so far as his positive administration was concerned,—perishing under an intense and crushing storm of popular execration. But when we look at the whole case—when we survey, not merely the details of Phokion's administration, but the grand public objects which those details subserved, and towards which he conducted his fellow-citizens—we shall see that this judgment is fully merited. In Phokion's patriotism—for so doubtless he himself sincerely conceived it—no account was taken of Athenian independence; of the autonomy or self-management of the Hellenic world; of the conditions, in reference to foreign kings, under which alone such autonomy could exist. He had neither the Pan-hellenic sentiment of Aristeides, Kallikratidas, and Demosthenes—nor the narrower Athenian sentiment, like the devotion of Agesilaus to Sparta, and of Epaminondas to Thebes. To Phokion it was indifferent whether

Greece was an aggregate of autonomous cities, with Athens as first or second among them—or one of the satrapies under the Macedonian kings. Now this was among the most fatal defects of a Grecian public man. The sentiment in which Phokion was wanting, lay at the bottom of all those splendid achievements which have given to Greece a substantive and pre-eminent place in the history of the world. Had Themistokles, Aristeides, and Leonidas resembled him, Greece would have passed quietly under the dominion of Persia, and the brilliant, though chequered, century and more of independent politics which succeeded the repulse of Xerxes would never have occurred. It was precisely during the fifty years of Phokion's political and military influence, that the Greeks were degraded from a state of freedom, and Athens from ascendency as well as freedom, into absolute servitude. Insofar as this great public misfortune can be imputed to any one man—to no one was it more ascribable than to Phokion. He was stratêgus during most of the long series of years when Philip's power was growing; it was his duty to look ahead for the safety of his countrymen, and to combat the yet immature giant. He heard the warnings of Demosthenes, and he possessed exactly those qualities which were wanting to Demosthenes —military energy and aptitude. Had he lent his influence to inform the short-sightedness, to stimulate the inertia, to direct the armed efforts, of his countrymen, the kings of Macedon might have been kept within their own limits, and the future history of Greece might have been altogether different.

Unfortunately, he took the opposite side. He acted with Æschines and the philippizers; without receiving money from Philip, he did gratuitously all that Philip desired—by nullifying and sneering down the efforts of Demosthenes and the other active politicians. After the battle of Chæroneia, Phokion received from Philip first, and from Alexander afterwards, marks of esteem not shown towards any other Athenian. This was both the fruit and the proof of his past political action—anti-Hellenic as well as anti-Athenian. Having done much, in the earlier part of his life, to promote the subjugation of Greece under the Macedonian kings, he contributed somewhat, during the latter half, to lighten the severity of their dominion; and it is the most honourable point in his character that he always refrained from abusing their marked favour towards himself, for purposes either of personal gain or of oppression over his fellow-citizens. Alexander not only wrote letters to him, even during the plenitude of imperial power, in terms of respectful friendship, but tendered to him the largest presents—at one time the sum of 100 talents, at another time the choice of four towns on the coast of Asia Minor, as Xerxes gave to Themistokles. He even expressed his displeasure when Phokion, refusing everything, consented only to request the liberation of three Grecian prisoners confined at Sardis[1].

The Lamian war, and its consequences, were Phokion's ruin. He continued at Athens, throughout that war, freely declaring his opinion against it; for it is to be remarked, that in spite of his

[1] Plutarch, Phokion, 18; Plutarch, Apophthegm. p. 188.

known macedonizing politics, the people neither banished nor degraded him, but contented themselves with following the counsels of others. On the disastrous termination of the war, Phokion undertook the thankless and dishonourable function of satrap under Antipater at Athens, with the Macedonian garrison at Munychia to back him. He became the subordinate agent of a conqueror who not only slaughtered the chief Athenian orators, but disfranchised and deported the Demos in mass. Having accepted partnership and responsibility in these proceedings, Phokion was no longer safe except under the protection of a foreign prince. After the liberal proclamation issued in the name of the Macedonian kings, permitting the return of the banished Demos, he sought safety for himself, first by that treasonable connivance which enabled Nikanor to seize the Peiræus, next by courting Polysperchon the enemy of Nikanor. A voluntary expatriation (along with his friend the Phalerean Demetrius) would have been less dangerous, and less discreditable, than these manœuvres, which still farther darkened the close of his life, without averting from him, after all, the necessity of facing the restored Demos. The intense and unanimous wrath of the people against him is an instructive, though a distressing spectacle. It was directed, not against the man or the administrator—for in both characters Phokion had been blameless, except as to the last collusion with Nikanor in the seizure of the Peiræus —but against his public policy. It was the last protest of extinct Grecian freedom, speaking as it were from the tomb in a voice of thunder, against

that fatal system of mistrust, inertia, self-seeking, and corruption, which had betrayed the once autonomous Athens to a foreign conqueror.

B.C. 317, April. War between Polysperchon and Kassander, in Attica and Peloponnesus. Polysperchon is repulsed in the siege of Megalopolis, and also defeated at sea.

I have already mentioned that Polysperchon with his army was in Phokis when Phokion was brought before him, on his march towards Peloponnesus. Perhaps he may have been detained by negotiation with the Ætolians, who embraced his alliance[1]. At any rate he was tardy in his march, for before he reached Attica, Kassander arrived at Peiræus to join Nikanor with a fleet of thirty-five ships and 4000 soldiers obtained from Antigonus. On learning this fact, Polysperchon hastened his march also, and presented himself under the walls of Athens and Peiræus with a large force of 20,000 Macedonians, 4000 Greek allies, 1000 cavalry, and sixty-five elephants; animals which were now seen for the first time in European Greece. He at first besieged Kassander in Peiræus, but finding it difficult to procure subsistence in Attica for so numerous an army, he marched with the larger portion into Peloponnesus, leaving his son Alexander with a division to make head against Kassander. Either approaching in person the various Peloponnesian towns—or addressing them by means of envoys—he enjoined the subversion of the Antipatrian oligarchies, and the restoration of liberty and free speech to the mass of the citizens[2]. In most of the towns, this revolution was accomplished; but in Megalopolis, the oligarchy held out; not only forcing Polysperchon to besiege the city, but even defending it against him successfully. He made two or three

[1] Diodor. xix. 35.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 69.

attempts to storm it, by moveable towers, by undermining the walls, and even by the aid of elephants; but he was repulsed in all of them[1], and obliged to relinquish the siege with considerable loss of reputation. His admiral Kleitus was soon afterwards defeated in the Propontis, with the loss of his whole fleet, by Nikanor (whom Kassander had sent from Peiræus) and Antigonus[2].

Increased strength of Kassander in Greece—he gets possession of Athens.

After these two defeats, Polysperchon seems to have evacuated Peloponnesus, and to have carried his forces across the Corinthian Gulf into Epirus, to join Olympias. His party was greatly weakened all over Greece, and that of Kassander proportionally strengthened. The first effect of this was, the surrender of Athens. The Athenians in the city, including all or many of the restored exiles, could no longer endure that complete severance from the sea, to which the occupation of Peiræus and Munychia by Kassander had reduced them. Athens without a port was hardly tenable; in fact, Peiræus was considered by its great constructor, Themistokles, as more indispensable to the Athenians than Athens itself[3]. The subsistence of the people was derived in large proportion from imported corn, received through Peiræus; where also the trade and industrial operations were carried on, most of the revenue collected, and the arsenals, docks, ships, &c. of the state kept up. It became evident that Nikanor, by seizing on the Peiræus, had rendered Athens disarmed and helpless; so that the irreparable mischief done by Phokion, in

[1] Diodor. xviii. 70, 71.

[2] Diodor. xviii. 72.

[3] Thucyd. i. 93.

conniving at that seizure, was felt more and more every day. Hence the Athenians, unable to capture the port themselves, and hopeless of obtaining it through Polysperchon, felt constrained to listen to the partisans of Kassander, who proposed that terms should be made with him. It was agreed that they should become friends and allies of Kassander; that they should have full enjoyment of their city, with the port Peiræus, their ships, and revenues; that the exiles and deported citizens should be readmitted; that the political franchise should for the future be enjoyed by all citizens who possessed 1000 drachmæ of property and upwards; that Kassander should hold Munychia with a governor and garrison, until the war against Polysperchon was brought to a close; and that he should also name some one Athenian citizen, in whose hands the supreme government of the city should be vested. Kassander named Demetrius the Phalerean (*i. e.* an Athenian of the Deme Phalerum), one of the colleagues of Phokion; who had gone into voluntary exile since the death of Antipater, but had recently returned[1].

Restoration of the oligarchical government at Athens, though in a mitigated form, under the Phalerean Demetrius.

This convention restored substantially at Athens the Antipatrian government; yet without the severities which had marked its original establishment—and with some modifications in various ways. It made Kassander virtually master of the city (as Antipater had been before him), by means of his governing nominee, upheld by the garrison, and by the fortification of Munychia; which had now been

[1] Diodor. xviii. 74.

greatly enlarged and strengthened[1], holding a practical command over Peiræus, though that port was nominally relinquished to the Athenians. But there was no slaughter of orators, no expulsion of citizens; moreover, even the minimum of 1000 drachmæ, fixed for the political franchise, though excluding the multitude, must have been felt as an improvement compared with the higher limit of 2000 drachmæ prescribed by Antipater. Kassander was not, like his father, at the head of an overwhelming force, master of Greece. He had Polysperchon in the field against him with a rival army and an established ascendency in many of the Grecian cities; it was therefore his interest to abstain from measures of obvious harshness towards the Athenian people.

Administration of the Phalerean Demetrius at Athens, in a moderate spirit. Census taken of the Athenian population.

Towards this end his choice of the Phalerean Demetrius appears to have been judicious. That citizen continued to administer Athens, as satrap or despot under Kassander, for ten years. He was an accomplished literary man, friend both of the philosopher Theophrastus, who had succeeded to the school of Aristotle—and of the rhetor Deinarchus. He is described also as a person of expensive and luxurious habits; towards which he devoted the most of the Athenian public revenue, 1200 talents in amount, if Duris is to be believed. His administration is said to have been discreet and moderate. We know little of its details, but we are told, that he made sumptuary laws, especially

[1] See the notice of Munychia, as it stood ten years afterwards (Diodor. XX. 45).

restricting the cost and ostentation of funerals[1]. He himself extolled his own decennial period as one of abundance and flourishing commerce at Athens[2]. But we learn from others, and the fact is highly probable, that it was a period of distress and humiliation, both at Athens and in other Grecian towns; and that Athenians, as well as others, welcomed new projects of colonization (such as that of Ophellas from Kyrênê) not simply from prospects of advantage, but also as an escape from existing evils[3].

What forms of nominal democracy were kept up during this interval, we cannot discover. The popular judicature must have been continued for private suits and accusations, since Deinarchus is said to have been in large practice as a logographer, or composer of discourses for others[4]. But the fact

[1] Cicero, De Legg. ii. 26, 66; Strabo, ix. p. 398; Pausanias, i. 25, 5. τύραννον τε Ἀθηναίοις ἔπραξε γενέσθαι Δημήτριον, &c. Duris ap. Athenæum, xii. 542. Fragm. 27. vol. iii. p. 477. Frag. Hist. Græc.

The Phalerean Demetrius composed, among numerous historical, philosophical, and literary works, a narrative of his own decennial administration (Diogenes Laert. v. 5, 9; Strabo, ib.)—περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας.

The statement of 1200 talents, as the annual revenue handled by Demetrius, deserves little credit.

[2] See the Fragment of Democharcs, 2; Fragment. Historic. Græc. ed. Didot, vol. ii. p. 448, ap. Polyb. xii. 13. Democharcs, nephew of the orator Demosthenes, was the political opponent of Demetrius Phalereus, whom he reproached with these boasts about commercial prosperity, when the liberty and dignity of the city were overthrown. To such boasts of Demetrius Phalereus probably belongs the statement cited from him by Strabo (iii. p. 147) about the laborious works in the Attic mines at Laureium.

[3] Diodor. xx. 40. ὥσθ' ὑπελάμβανον μὴ μόνον ἐγκρατεῖς ἔσεσθαι πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν παρόντων κακῶν ἀπαλλαγήσεσθαι.

[4] Dionys. Halic. Judicium de Dinarcho, p. 633, 634; Plutarch, De-

that three hundred and sixty statues were erected in honour of Demetrius while his administration was still going on, demonstrates the gross flattery of his partisans, the subjection of the people, and the practical abolition of all free-spoken censure or pronounced opposition. We learn that, in some one of the ten years of his administration, a census was taken of the inhabitants of Attica; and that there were numbered, 21,000 citizens, 10,000 metics, and 400,000 slaves[1]. Of this important

metrius, 10. λόγῳ μὲν ὀλιγαρχικῆς, ἔργῳ δὲ μοναρχικῆς, καταστάσεως γενομένης διὰ τὴν τοῦ Φαληρέως δύναμιν, &c.

[1] Ktesikles ap. Athenæum, vi. p. 272. Mr. Fynes Clinton (following Wesseling), supplies the defect in the text of Athenæus, so as to assign the census to the 115th Olympiad. This conjecture *may* be right, yet the reasons for it are not conclusive. The census may have been either in the 116th, or in the 117th Olympiad; we have no means of determining which. The administration of Phalerean Demetrius covers the ten years between 317 and 307 B.C. (Fast. Hell. Append. p. 388).

Mr. Clinton (ad ann. 317 B.C. Fast. Hell.) observes respecting the census—"The 21,000 Athenians express those who had votes in the public assembly, or all the males above the age of twenty years; the 10,000 μέτοικοι described also the males of full age. When the women and children are computed, the total free population will be about 127,660; and 400,000 slaves, added to this total, will give about 527,660 for the total population of Attica." See also the Appendix to F. H. p. 390 *seq.*

This census is a very interesting fact; but our information respecting it is miserably scanty, and Mr. Clinton's interpretation of the different numbers is open to some remark. He cannot be right, I think, in saying—"The 21,000 Athenians express those who had votes in the assembly, *or* all the males above the age of twenty years." For we are expressly told, that under the administration of Demetrius Phalereus, all persons who did not possess 1000 drachmæ were excluded from the political franchise; and therefore a large number of males above the age of twenty years would have no vote in the assembly. Since the two categories are not coincident, then, to which shall we apply the number 21,000? To those who had votes? Or to the total number of free citizens, voting or not voting, above the age of twenty? The public assembly, during the administration of Demetrius Phalereus, appears to have been of little moment or efficacy; so that a distinct record, of the

enumeration we know the bare fact, without its special purpose or even its precise date. Perhaps some of those citizens, who had been banished or deported at the close of the Lamian war, may have returned and continued to reside at Athens. But there still seems to have remained, during all the continuance of the Kassandrian oligarchy, a body of adverse Athenian exiles, watching for an opportunity of overthrowing it, and seeking aid for that purpose from the Ætolians and others[1].

B.C. 317, autumn. Kassander in Peloponnesus—many cities join him—the Spartans surround their city with walls.

The acquisition of Athens by Kassander, followed up by his capture of Panaktum and Salamis, and seconded by his moderation towards the Athenians, procured for him considerable support in Peloponnesus—many cities joining him—the Spartans surrounding their city with walls.

number of persons entitled to vote in it, is not likely to have been sought.

Then again, Mr. Clinton interprets the three numbers given, upon two principles totally distinct. The two first numbers (citizens and metics), he considers to designate only males of full age; the third number, of *οἰκέται*, he considers to include both sexes and all ages.

This is a conjecture which I think very doubtful, in the absence of farther knowledge. It implies that the enumerators take account of the *slave* women and children—but that they take no account of the *free* women and children, wives and families of the citizens and metics. The number of the free women and children are wholly unrecorded, on Mr. Clinton's supposition. Now if, for the purposes of the census, it was necessary to enumerate the *slave* women and children—it surely would be not less necessary to enumerate the *free* women and children.

The word *οἰκέται* sometimes means, not slaves only, but the inmates of a family generally—free as well as slave. If such be its meaning here (which however there is not evidence enough to affirm), we eliminate the difficulty of supposing the slave women and children to be enumerated—and the free women and children *not* to be enumerated.

We should be able to reason more confidently, if we knew the purpose for which the census had been taken—whether with a view to military or political measures—to finance and taxation—or to the question of subsistence and importation of foreign corn (see Mr. Clinton's Fast. II. ad ann. 444 B.C., about another census taken in reference to imported corn).

[1] See Dionys. Halic. Judic. de Dinarcho, p. 658 Reisk.

nesus, whither he proceeded with his army[1]. Many of the cities, intimidated or persuaded, joined him and deserted Polysperchon; while the Spartans, now feeling for the first time their defenceless condition, thought it prudent to surround their city with walls[2]. This fact, among many others contemporaneous, testifies emphatically, how the characteristic sentiments of the Hellenic autonomous world were now dying out everywhere. The maintenance of Sparta as an unwalled city, was one of the deepest and most cherished of the Lykurgean traditions; a standing proof of the fearless bearing and self-confidence of the Spartans against dangers from without. The erection of the walls showed their own conviction, but too well borne out by the real circumstances around them, that the pressure of the foreigner had become so overwhelming as hardly to leave them even safety at home.

B.C. 317, autumn. Feud in the Macedonian imperial family—Olympias puts to death Philip Aridæus and Eurydikê—she reigns in Macedonia: her bloody revenge against the partisans of Antipater.

The warfare between Kassander and Polysperchon became now embittered by a feud among the members of the Macedonian imperial family. King Philip Aridæus and his wife Eurydikê, alarmed and indignant at the restoration of Olympias which Polysperchon was projecting, solicited aid from Kassander, and tried to place the force of Macedonia at his disposal. In this however they failed. Olympias, assisted not only by Polysperchon, but by the Epirotic prince Æakides, made her entry into Macedonia out of Epirus, apparently in the autumn of 317 B.C. She brought with her Roxana and her child—the widow

[1] Diodor. xviii. 75.

[2] Justin, xiv. 5; Diodor. xviii. 75; Pausan. vii. 8, 3; Pausanias, i. 25, 5.

and son of Alexander the Great. The Macedonian soldiers, assembled by Philip Aridæus and Eurydikê to resist her, were so overawed by her name and the recollection of Alexander, that they refused to fight, and thus ensured to her an easy victory. Philip and Eurydikê became her prisoners; the former she caused to be slain; to the latter she offered only an option between the sword, the halter, and poison. The old queen next proceeded to satiate her revenge against the family of Antipater. One hundred leading Macedonians, friends of Kassander, were put to death, together with his brother Nikanor[1]; while the sepulchre of his deceased brother Iollas, accused of having poisoned Alexander the Great, was broken up.

B.C. 316. Kassander passes into Macedonia —defeats Olympias, and becomes master of the country —Olympias is besieged in Pydna, captured, and put to death.

During the winter, Olympias remained thus completely predominant in Macedonia; where her position seemed strong, since her allies the Ætolians were masters of the pass at Thermopylæ, while Kassander was kept employed in Peloponnesus by the force under Alexander, son of Polysperchon. But Kassander, disengaging himself from these embarrassments, and eluding Thermopylæ by a maritime transit to Thessaly, seized the Perrhæbian passes before they had been put under guard, and entered Macedonia without resistance. Olympias, having no army competent to meet him in the field; was forced to shut herself up in the maritime fortress of Pydna, with Roxana, the child Alexander, and Thessalonikê daughter of her late husband Philip son of Amyntas[2]. Here Kassander blocked her up

[1] Diodor. xix. 11; Justin, x. 14, 4; Pausanias, i. 11, 4.
[2] Diodor. xix. 36.

for several months by sea as well as by land, and succeeded in defeating all the efforts of Polysperchon and Æakides to relieve her. In the spring of the ensuing year (316 B.C.), she was forced by intolerable famine to surrender. Kassander promised her nothing more than personal safety, requiring from her the surrender of the two great fortresses, Pella and Amphipolis, which made him master of Macedonia. Presently however, the relatives of those numerous victims, who had perished by order of Olympias, were encouraged by Kassander to demand her life in retribution. They found little difficulty in obtaining a verdict of condemnation against her from what was called a Macedonian assembly. Nevertheless, such was the sentiment of awe and reverence connected with her name, that no one except these injured men themselves could be found to execute the sentence. She died with a courage worthy of her rank and domineering character. Kassander took Thessalonikê to wife—confined Roxana with the child Alexander in the fortress of Amphipolis—where (after a certain interval) he caused both of them to be slain[1].

B.C. 315. Great power of Antigonus in Asia. Confederacy of Kassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleukus against him.

While Kassander was thus master of Macedonia —and while the imperial family were disappearing from the scene in that country—the defeat and death of Eumenes (which happened nearly at the same time as the capture of Olympias[2]) removed the last faithful partisan of that family in

[1] Diodor. xix. 50, 51; Justin, xiv. 5; Pausan. i. 25, 5; ix. 7, 1.

[2] Even immediately before the death of Olympias, Aristonous, governor of Amphipolis in her interest, considered Eumenes to be still alive (Diodor. xix. 50).

Asia. But at the same time, it left in the hands of Antigonus such overwhelming preponderance throughout Asia, that he aspired to become vicar and master of the entire Alexandrine empire, as well as to avenge upon Kassander the extirpation of the regal family. His power appeared indeed so formidable, that Kassander of Macedonia, Lysimachus of Thrace, Ptolemy of Egypt, and Seleukus of Babylonia, entered into a convention, which gradually ripened into an active alliance, against him.

B.C. 315–314. Kassander founds Kassandreia, and restores Thebes.

During the struggles between these powerful princes, Greece appears simply as a group of subject cities, held, garrisoned, grasped at, or coveted, by all of them. Polysperchon, abandoning all hopes in Macedonia after the death of Olympias, had been forced to take refuge among the Ætolians, leaving his son Alexander to make the best struggle that he could in Peloponnesus; so that Kassander was now decidedly preponderant throughout the Hellenic regions. After fixing himself on the throne of Macedonia, he perpetuated his own name by founding, on the isthmus of the peninsula of Pallênê and near the site where Potidæa had stood, the new city of Kassandreia; into which he congregated a large number of inhabitants from the neighbourhood, and especially the remnant of the citizens of Olynthus and Potidæa,—towns taken and destroyed by Philip more than thirty years before[1]. He next marched into Peloponnesus with his army against Alexander son of Polysperchon. Passing though Bœotia, he undertook the task of restoring the city of Thebes, which had been destroyed twenty years previously

[1] Diodor. xix. 52; Pausanias, v. 23, 2.

by Alexander the Great, and had ever since existed only as a military post on the ancient citadel called Kadmeia. The other Bœotian towns, to whom the old Theban territory had been assigned, were persuaded or constrained to relinquish it; and Kassander invited from all parts of Greece the Theban exiles or their descendants. From sympathy with these exiles, and also with the ancient celebrity of the city, many Greeks, even from Italy and Sicily, contributed to the restoration. The Athenians, now administered by Demetrius Phalereus under Kassander's supremacy, were particularly forward in the work; the Messenians and Megalopolitans, whose ancestors had owed so much to the Theban Epaminondas, lent strenuous aid. Thebes was re-established in the original area which it had occupied before Alexander's siege; and was held by a Kassandrian garrison in the Kadmeia, destined for the mastery of Bœotia and Greece[1].

After some stay at Thebes, Kassander advanced towards Peloponnesus. Alexander (son of Polysperchon) having fortified the Isthmus, he was forced to embark his troops with his elephants at Megara, and cross over the Saronic Gulf to Epidaurus. He dispossessed Alexander of Argos, of Messenia, and even of his position on the Isthmus, where he left a powerful detachment, and then B.C. 314.

[1] Diodor. xix. 52, 54, 78; Pausan. ix. 7, 2-5. This seems an explanation of Kassander's proceeding, more probable than that given by Pausanias; who tells us that Kassander hated the memory of Alexander the Great, and wished to undo the consequences of his acts. That he did so hate Alexander, is however extremely credible: see Plutarch, Alexand. 74.

Measures of Antigonus against Kassander—he promises freedom to the Grecian cities—Ptolemy promises the like. Great power of Kassander in Greece.

returned to Macedonia[1]. His increasing power raised both apprehension and hatred in the bosom of Antigonus, who endeavoured to come to terms with him, but in vain[2]. Kassander preferred the alliance with Ptolemy, Seleukus, and Lysimachus—against Antigonus, who was now master of nearly the whole of Asia, inspiring common dread to all of them[3]. Accordingly, from Asia to Peloponnesus, with arms and money, Antigonus despatched the Milesian Aristodemus to strengthen Alexander against Kassander; whom he farther denounced as an enemy of the Macedonian name, because he had slain Olympias, imprisoned the other members of the regal family, and re-established the Olynthian exiles. He caused the absent Kassander to be condemned by what was called a Macedonian assembly, upon these and other charges.

Antigonus farther proclaimed, by the voice of this assembly, that all the Greeks should be free, self-governing, and exempt from garrisons or military occupation[4]. It was expected that these brilliant promises would enlist partisans in Greece against Kassander; accordingly Ptolemy ruler of Egypt, one of the enemies of Antigonus, thought fit to issue similar proclamations a few months afterwards, tendering to the Greeks the same boon from himself[5]. These promises, neither executed, nor intended to be executed, by either of the kings, appear to have produced little or no effect upon the Greeks.

[1] Diodor. xix. 54.
[2] Diodor. xix. 56.
[3] Diodor. xix. 57.
[4] Diodor. xix. 61.
[5] Diodor. xix. 62.

The arrival of Aristodemus in Peloponnesus had re-animated the party of Alexander (son of Polysperchon), against whom Kassander was again obliged to bring his full forces from Macedonia. Though successful against Alexander at Argos, Orchomenus, and other places, Kassander was not able to crush him, and presently thought it prudent to gain him over. He offered to him the separate government of Peloponnesus, though in subordination to himself: Alexander accepted the offer, becoming Kassander's ally[1]—and carried on war, jointly with him, against Aristodemus, with varying success, until he was presently assassinated by some private enemies. Nevertheless his widow Kratesipolis, a woman of courage and energy, still maintained herself in considerable force at Sikyon[2]. Kassander's most obstinate enemies were the Ætolians, of whom we now first hear formal mention as a substantive confederacy[3]. These Ætolians became the allies of Antigonus as they had been before of Polysperchon, extending their predatory ravages even as far as Attica. Protected against foreign garrisons, partly by their rude and fierce habits, partly by their mountainous territory, they were almost the only Greeks who could still be called free. Kassander tried to keep them in check through their neighbours the Akarnanians, whom he induced to adopt a more concentrated habit of residence, consolidating their numerous petty townships into a few considerable towns,—Stratus, Sauria, and Agri-

[1] Diodor. xix. 63, 64. [2] Diodor. xix. 62, 67.

[3] Diodor. xix. 66. Ἀριστόδημος, ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν δικαιολογησάμενος, προετρέψατο τὰ πλήθη βοηθεῖν τοῖς Ἀντιγόνου πράγμασιν, &c.

nium—convenient posts for Macedonian garrisons. He also made himself master of Leukas, Apollonia, and Epidamnus, defeating the Illyrian king Glaukias, so that his dominion now extended across from the Thermaic to the Adriatic Gulf[1]. His general Philippus gained two important victories over the Ætolians and Epirots, forcing the former to relinquish some of their most accessible towns[2].

B.C. 312. Forces of Antigonus in Greece. Considerable success against Kassander.

The power of Antigonus in Asia underwent a material diminution, by the successful and permanent establishment which Seleukus now acquired in Babylonia; from which event the era of the succeeding Seleukidæ takes its origin. In Greece, however, Antigonus gained ground on Kassander. He sent thither his nephew Ptolemy with a large force to liberate the Greeks, or in other words, to expel the Kassandrian garrisons; while he at the same time distracted Kassander's attention by threatening to cross the Hellespont and invade Macedonia. This Ptolemy (not the Egyptian) expelled the soldiers of Kassander from Eubœa, Bœotia, and Phokis. Chalkis in Eubœa was at this time the chief military station of Kassander; Thebes (which he had recently re-established) was in alliance with him; but the remaining Bœotian towns were hostile to him. Ptolemy, having taken Chalkis—the citizens of which he conciliated by leaving them without any garrison—together with Oropus, Eretria, and Karystus—entered Attica and presented himself before Athens. So much disposition to treat with

[1] Diodor. xix. 67, 68; Justin, xv. 2. See Brandstäter, Geschichte des Ætolischen Volkes und Bundes, p. 178 (Berlin, 1844).

[2] Diodor. xix. 74.

him was manifested in the city, that Demetrius the Phalerean was obliged to gain time by pretending to open negotiations with Antigonus, while Ptolemy withdrew from Attica. Nearly at the same epoch, Apollonia, Epidamnus, and Leukas, found means, assisted by an armament from Korkyra, to drive out Kassander's garrisons, and to escape from his dominion[1]. The affairs of Antigonus were now prospering in Greece, but they were much thrown back by the discontent and treachery of his admiral Telesphorus, who seized Elis and even plundered the sacred treasures of Olympia. Ptolemy presently put him down, and restored these treasures to the God[2].

B.C. 311. Pacification between the belligerents. Grecian autonomy guaranteed in name by all. Kassander puts to death Roxana and her child.

In the ensuing year, a convention was concluded between Antigonus, on one side—and Kassander, Ptolemy (the Egyptian) and Lysimachus, on the other, whereby the supreme command in Macedonia was guaranteed to Kassander, until the maturity of Alexander son of Roxana; Thrace being at the same time assured to Lysimachus, Egypt to Ptolemy, and the whole of Asia to Antigonus. It was at the same time covenanted by all, that the Hellenic cities should be free[3]. Towards the execution of this last clause, however, nothing was actually done. Nor does it appear that the treaty had any other effect, except to inspire Kassander with increased jealousy about Roxana and her child; both of whom (as has been already stated) he caused to be secretly assassinated soon afterwards, by the governor Glaukias, in the fortress of

[1] Diodor. xix. 77, 78, 89.
[2] Diodor. xix. 87.
[3] Diodor. xix. 105.

Amphipolis, where they had been confined[1]. The forces of Antigonus, under his general Ptolemy, still remained in Greece. But this general presently (310 B.C.) revolted from Antigonus, and placed them in cooperation with Kassander; while Ptolemy of Egypt, accusing Antigonus of having contravened the treaty by garrisoning various Grecian cities, renewed the war and the triple alliance against him[2].

Polysperchon espouses the pretensions of Herakles, son of Alexander, against Kassander. He enters into compact with Kassander, assassinates the young prince, and is recognized as ruler of Southern Greece.

Polyspherchon,—who had hitherto maintained a local dominion over various parts of Peloponnesus, with a military force distributed in Messênê and other towns[3]—was now encouraged by Antigonus to espouse the cause of Herakles (son of Alexander by Barsinê), and to place him on the throne of Macedonia in opposition to Kassander. This young prince Herakles, now seventeen years of age, was sent to Greece from Pergamus in Asia, and his pretensions to the throne were assisted not only by a considerable party in Macedonia itself, but also by the Ætolians. Polysperchon invaded Macedonia, with favourable prospects of establishing the young prince; yet he thought it advantageous to accept treacherous propositions from Kassander, who offered to him partnership in the sovereignty of Macedonia, with an independent army and dominion in Peloponnesus. Polysperchon, tempted by these offers, assassinated the young prince Herakles, and withdrew his army towards Peloponnesus. But he found such unexpected opposition, in his march through Bœotia, from Bœotians and

[1] Diodor. xix. 105.

[2] Diodor. xx. 19.

[3] Messênê was garrisoned by Polysperchon (Diodor. xix. 64).

Peloponnesians, that he was forced to take up his winter quarters in Lokris[1] (309 B.C.). From this time forward, as far as we can make out, he commanded in Southern Greece as subordinate ally or partner of Kassander[2]; whose Macedonian dominion, thus confirmed, seems to have included Akarnania and Amphilochia on the Ambrakian Gulf, together with the town of Ambrakia itself, and a supremacy over many of the Epirots.

B.C. 308. Assassination of Kleopatra, last surviving relative of Alexander the Great, by Antigonus.

The assassination of Herakles was speedily followed by that of Kleopatra, sister of Alexander the Great, and daughter of Philip and Olympias. She had been for some time at Sardis, nominally at liberty, yet under watch by the governor, who received his orders from Antigonus; she was now preparing to quit that place, for the purpose of joining Ptolemy in Egypt, and of becoming his wife. She had been invoked as auxiliary, or courted in marriage, by several of the great Macedonian chiefs, without any result. Now, however, Antigonus, afraid of the influence which her name might throw into the scale of his rival Ptolemy, caused her to be secretly murdered as she was preparing for her departure; throwing the blame of the deed on some of her women, whom he punished with death[3]. All the relatives of Alexander the Great (except Thessalonikê wife of Kassander, daughter of Philip by a Thessalian

[1] Diodor. xx. 28; Trogus Pompeius—Proleg. ad Justin. xv.; Justin, xv. 2.

[2] Diodor. xx. 100-103; Plutarch, Pyrrhus, 6. King Pyrrhus was of προγόνων ἀεὶ δεδουλευκότων Μακεδόσι—at least this was the reproach of Lysimachus (Plutarch, Pyrrhus, 12).

[3] Diodor. xx. 37: compare Justin, xiii. 6; xiv. 1.

mistress) thus successively perished, and all by the orders of one or other among his principal officers. The imperial family, with the prestige of its name, thus came to an end.

Ptolemy of Egypt in Greece—after some successes, he concludes a truce with Kassander. Passiveness of the Grecian cities.

Ptolemy of Egypt now set sail for Greece with a powerful armament. He acquired possession of the important cities—Sikyon and Corinth—which were handed over to him by Kratesipolis, widow of Alexander son of Polysperchon. He then made known by proclamation his purpose as a liberator, inviting aid from the Peloponnesian cities themselves against the garrisons of Kassander. From some he received encouraging answers and promises; but none of them made any movement, or seconded him by armed demonstrations. He thought it prudent therefore to conclude a truce with Kassander and retire from Greece, leaving however secure garrisons in Sikyon and Corinth[1]. The Grecian cities had now become tame and passive. Feeling their own incapacity of self-defence, and averse to auxiliary efforts, which brought upon them enmity without any prospect of advantage—they awaited only the turns of foreign interference and the behests of the potentates around them.

B.C. 307. The Grecian ascendency of Kassander, however, was in the following year exposed to a graver shock than it had ever yet encountered—by the sudden invasion of Demetrius called Poliorketes, son of Antigonus. This young prince, sailing from Ephesus with a formidable armament, contrived to conceal his purposes so closely, that he actually entered the harbour of Peiræus (on the 26th of the

[1] Diodor. xx. 37.

month Thargelion—May) without expectation, or resistance from any one; his fleet being mistaken for the fleet of the Egyptian Ptolemy. The Phalerean Demetrius, taken unawares, and attempting too late to guard the harbour, found himself compelled to leave it in possession of the enemy, and to retire within the walls of Athens; while Dionysius, the Kassandrian governor, maintained himself with his garrison in Munychia, yet without any army competent to meet the invaders in the field. This accomplished Phalerean, who had administered for ten years as the viceroy and with the force of Kassander, now felt his position and influence at Athens overthrown, and even his personal safety endangered. He with other Athenians went as envoys on the ensuing day to ascertain what terms would be granted. The young prince ostentatiously proclaimed, that it was the intention of his father Antigonus and himself to restore and guarantee to the Athenians unqualified freedom and autonomy. Hence the Phalerean Demetrius foresaw that his internal opponents, condemned as they had been to compulsory silence during the last ten years, would now proclaim themselves with irresistible violence, so that there was no safety for him except in retreat. He accordingly asked and obtained permission from the invader to retire to Thebes, from whence he passed over soon after to Ptolemy in Egypt. The Athenians in the city declared in favour of Demetrius Poliorketes; who however refused to enter the walls until he should have besieged and captured Munychia, as well as Megara, with their Kassandrian garrisons. In a short time

Sudden arrival of Demetrius Poliorketes in Peiræus. The Athenians declare in his favour. Demetrius Phalereus retires to Egypt. Capture of Munychia and Megara.

he accomplished both these objects. Indeed energy, skill, and effective use of engines, in besieging fortified places, were among the most conspicuous features in his character; procuring for him the surname whereby he is known to history. He proclaimed the Megarians free, levelling to the ground the fortifications of Munychia, as an earnest to the Athenians that they should be relieved for the future from all foreign garrison[1].

B.C. 307. Demetrius Poliorketes enters Athens in triumph. He promises restoration of the democracy. Extravagant votes of flattery passed by the Athenians towards him. Two new Athenian tribes created.

After these successes, Demetrius Poliorketes made his triumphant entry into Athens. He announced to the people, in formal assembly, that they were now again a free democracy, liberated from all dominion either of soldiers from abroad or oligarchs at home. He also promised them a farther boon from his father Antigonus and himself—150,000 medimni of corn for distribution, and ship-timber in quantity sufficient for constructing 100 triremes. Both these announcements were received with grateful exultation. The feelings of the people were testified not merely in votes of thanks and admiration towards the young conqueror, but also in effusions of unmeasured and exorbitant flattery. Stratokles (who has already been before us as one of the accusers of Demosthenes in the Harpalian affair) with others exhausted their invention in devising new varieties of compliment and adulation. Antigonus and Demetrius were proclaimed to be not only kings, but Gods and Saviours: a high priest of these Saviours was to be annually chosen,

[1] Philochor. Fragm. 144, ed. Didot; Diodor. xx. 45, 46; Plutarch, Demetrius, 8, 9. The occupation of Peirœus by Demetrius Poliorketes is related somewhat differently by Polyænus, iv. 7, 6.

after whom each successive year was to be named (instead of being named after the first of the nine Archons, as had hitherto been the custom), and the dates of decrees and contracts commemorated; the month Munychion was re-named as Demetrion—two new tribes, to be called Antigonis and Demetrias, were constituted in addition to the preceding ten:—the annual senate was appointed to consist of 600 members instead of 500; the portraits and exploits of Antigonus and Demetrius were to be woven, along with those of Zeus and Athênê, into the splendid and voluminous robe periodically carried in procession, as an offering at the Panathenaic festival; the spot of ground where Demetrius had alighted from his chariot, was consecrated with an altar erected in honour of Demetrius Katæbates or the Descender. Several other similar votes were passed, recognizing, and worshiping as Gods, the Saviours Antigonus and Demetrius. Nay, we are told that temples or altars were voted to Phila-Aphroditê, in honour of Phila wife of Demetrius; and a like compliment was paid to his two mistresses, Leæna and Lamia. Altars are said to have been also dedicated to Adeimantus and others, his convivial companions or flatterers[1]. At the same time the numerous statues, which had been erected in honour of the Phalerean Demetrius during his decennial government, were overthrown, and some of them even turned to ignoble purposes, in order to cast greater scorn upon the past ruler[2]. The demonstrations of ser-

[1] Plutarch, Demetrius, 9-11; Diodor. xx. 47; Demochares ap. Athenæum, vi. p. 253.

[2] Diogen. Laert. v. 77. Among the numerous literary works (all

vile flattery at Athens, towards Demetrius Poliorketes, were in fact so extravagantly overdone, that he himself is said to have been disgusted with them, and to have expressed contempt for these degenerate Athenians of his own time[1].

B.C. 307. Alteration of tone and sentiment in Athens, during the last thirty years.

In reviewing such degrading proceedings, we must recollect that thirty-one years had now elapsed since the battle of Chæroneia, and that during all this time the Athenians had been under the practical ascendency, and constantly augmenting pressure, of foreign potentates. The sentiment of this dependence on Macedonia had been continually strengthened by all the subsequent events—by the capture and destruction of Thebes, and the subsequent overwhelming conquests of Alexander—by the deplorable conclusion of the Lamian war, the slaughter of the free-spoken orators, the death of the energetic military leaders, and the deportation of Athenian citizens—lastly, by the continued presence of a Macedonian garrison in Peiræus or Munychia. By Phokion, Demetrius Phalereus, and the other leading statesmen of this long period, submission to Macedonia had been inculcated as a virtue, while the recollection of the dignity and grandeur of old autonomous Athens had been effaced or denounced as a mischievous dream. The fifteen years between the close of the Lamian war and the arrival of Demetrius Poliorketes (322–307 B.C.), had witnessed no free play, nor public discussion and expression, of conflicting opinions; the short period during which Phokion was con-

lost) of the Phalerean Demetrius, one was entitled Ἀθηναίων καταδρομή (ib. v. 82).

[1] Democharès ap. Athenæum, vi. p. 253.

demned must be excepted, but that lasted only long enough to give room for the outburst of a preconceived but suppressed antipathy.

During this thirty years, of which the last half had been an aggravation of the first, a new generation of Athenians had grown up, accustomed to an altered phase of political existence. How few of those who received Demetrius Poliorketes, had taken part in the battle of Chæroneia, or listened to the stirring exhortations of Demosthenes in the war which preceded that disaster[1]! Of the citizens who yet retained courage and patriotism to struggle again for their freedom after the death of Alexander, how many must have perished with Leosthenes in the Lamian war! The Athenians of 307 B.C. had come to conceive their own city, and Hellas generally, as dependent first on Kassander, next on the possible intervention of his equally overweening rivals, Ptolemy, Antigonus, Lysimachus, &c. If they shook off the yoke of one potentate, it could only be by the protectorate of another. The sentiment of political self-reliance and autonomy had fled; the conception of a citizen military force, furnished by confederate and co-operating cities, had been superseded by the spectacle of vast standing armies, organized by the heirs of Alexander and of his traditions.

Two centuries before (510 B.C.), when the Lacedæmonians expelled the despot Hippias and his mercenaries from Athens, there sprang up at once

[1] Tacitus, Annal. i. 3. "Juniores post Actiacam victoriam, seniores plerique inter bella civium, nati: quotusquisque reliquus, qui rempublicam vidisset?"

Contrast of Athens as proclaimed free by Demetrius Poliorketes, with Athens after the expulsion of Hippias.

among the Athenian people a forward and devoted patriotism, which made them willing to brave, and competent to avert, all dangers in defence of their newly-acquired liberty[1]. At that time, the enemies by whom they were threatened, were Lacedæmonians, Thebans, Æginetans, Chalkidians, and the like (for the Persian force did not present itself until after some interval, and attacked not Athens alone, but Greece collectively). These hostile forces, though superior in number and apparent value to those of Athens, were yet not so disproportionate as to engender hopelessness and despair. Very different were the facts in 307 B.C., when Demetrius Poliorketes removed the Kassandrian mercenaries with their fortress Munychia, and proclaimed Athens free. To maintain that freedom by their own strength—in opposition to the evident superiority of organized force residing in the potentates around, one or more of whom had nearly all Greece under military occupation,—was an enterprise too hopeless to have been attempted even by men such as the combatants of Marathon or the contemporaries of Perikles. "Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow!" but the Athenians had not force enough to strike it; and the liberty proclaimed by Demetrius Poliorketes was a boon dependent upon him for its extent and even for its continuance. The Athenian assembly of that day was held under his army as masters of Attica, as it had been held a few months before under the controling force of the Phalerean Demetrius together with the Kassandrian governor of Munychia; and the most fulsome votes of adu-

[1] Herodotus, v. 78.

lation proposed in honour of Demetrius Poliorketes by his partisans, though perhaps disapproved by many, would hardly find a single pronounced opponent.

Opposition made by Demochares, nephew of Demosthenes, to these obsequious public flatteries.

One man, however, there was, who ventured to oppose several of the votes—the nephew of Demosthenes—Demochares; who deserves to be commemorated as the last known spokesman of free Athenian citizenship. We know only that such were his general politics, and that his opposition to the obsequious rhetor Stratokles ended in banishment, four years afterwards[1]. He appears to have discharged the functions of general during this period—to have been active in strengthening the fortifications and military equipment of the city—and to have been employed in occasional missions[2].

Demetrius Phalereus condemned in his absence. Honourable commemoration of the deceased orator Lykurgus.

The altered politics of Athens were manifested by impeachment against Demetrius Phalereus and other leading partisans of the late Kassandrian government. He and many others had already gone into voluntary exile; when their trials came on, they were not forthcoming, and all were condemned to death. But all those who remained, and presented themselves for trial, were acquitted[3]; so little was there of reactionary violence on this occasion. Stratokles also proposed a decree, commemorating the orator Lykurgus (who had been dead about seventeen years) by a statue, an honorary inscription, and a grant of maintenance in the Prytaneum to his eldest surviving descendant[4]. Among

[1] Plutarch, Demetr. 24.

[2] Polybius, xii. 13; Decretum apud Plutarch. Vit. X. Oratt. p. 851.

[3] Philochori Fragm. 144, ed. Didot, ap. Dionys. Hal. p. 636.

[4] Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 842-852. Lykurgus at his death (about 324 B.C.) left three sons, who are said, shortly after his death, to have

those who accompanied the Phalerean Demetrius into exile was the rhetor or logographer Deinarchus.

Restrictive law passed against the philosophers—they all leave Athens. The law is repealed next year, and the philosophers return to Athens.

The friendship of this obnoxious Phalerean, and of Kassander also, towards the philosopher Theophrastus, seems to have been one main cause which occasioned the enactment of a restrictive law against the liberty of philosophising. It was decreed, on the proposition of a citizen named Sophokles, that no philosopher should be allowed to open a school or teach, except under special sanction obtained from a vote of the Senate and people. Such was the disgust and apprehension occasioned by the new restriction, that all the philosophers with one accord left Athens. This spirited protest, against authoritative restriction on the liberty of philosophy and teaching, found responsive sympathy among the Athenians. The celebrity of the schools and professors was in fact the only characteristic mark

been prosecuted by Menesæchmus, and put in prison ("handed over to the Eleven"). But Thrasykles, supported by Demokles, stood forward on their behalf; and Demosthenes, then in banishment at Trœzen, wrote emphatic remonstrances to the Athenians against such unworthy treatment of the sons of a distinguished patriot. Accordingly the Athenians soon repented and released them.

This is what we find stated in Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 842. The third of the so-called Demosthenic Epistles purports to be the letter written on this subject by Demosthenes.

The harsh treatment of the sons of Lykurgus (whatever it may have amounted to, and whatever may have been its ground) certainly did not last long; for in the next page of the very same Plutarchian life (p. 843), an account is given of the family of Lykurgus, which was ancient and sacerdotal; and it is there stated that his sons after his death fully sustained the dignified position of the family.

On what ground they were accused, we cannot make out. According to the Demosthenic epistle (which epistles I have before stated that I do not believe to be authentic), it was upon some allegation, which, if valid at all, ought to have been urged against Lykurgus himself during his life (p. 1477, 1478); but Lykurgus had been always honourably acquitted, and always held thoroughly estimable, up to the day of his death (p. 1475).

of dignity still remaining to them—when their power had become extinct, and when even their independence and free constitution had degenerated into a mere name. It was moreover the great temptation for young men, coming from all parts of Greece, to visit Athens. Accordingly, a year had hardly passed, when Philon, impeaching Sophokles the author of the law, under the Graphê Paranomôn, prevailed on the Dikastery to find him guilty, and condemn him to a fine of five talents. The restrictive law being thus repealed, the philosophers returned[1]. It is remarkable that Democharès stood forward as one of its advocates; defending Sophokles against the accuser Philon. From scanty notices remaining of the speech of Democharès, we gather that, while censuring the opinions no less than the characters of Plato and Aristotle, he denounced yet more bitterly their pupils, as being for the most part ambitious, violent, and treacherous men. He cited by name several among them, who had subverted the freedom of their respective cities, and committed gross outrages against their fellow-citizens[2].

Athenian envoys were despatched to Antigonus

[1] Diogen. Laert. v. 38. It is probably to this return of the philosophers that the φυγάδων κάθοδος mentioned by Philochorus, as foreshadowed by the omen in the Acropolis, alludes (Philochorus, Frag. 145, ed. Didot, ap. Dionys. Hal. p. 637).

[2] See the few fragments of Democharès collected in Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum, ed. Didot, vol. ii. p. 445, with the notes of Carl Müller.

See likewise Athenæus, xiii. 610, with the fragment from the comic writer Alexis. It is there stated that Lysimachus also, king of Thrace, had banished the philosophers from his dominions.

Democharès might find (besides the persons named in Athenæ. v. 215, xi. 508) other authentic examples of pupils of Plato and Isokrates who had been atrocious and sanguinary tyrants in their native cities—see the case of Klearchus of Herakleia, Memnon ap. Photium, Cod. 224. cap. 1. Chion and Leonides, the two young citizens who slew Klear-

B.C. 307. Exploits of Demetrius Poliorketes. His long siege of Rhodes. Gallant and successful resistance of the citizens.

in Asia, to testify the gratitude of the people, and communicate the recent complimentary votes. Antigonus not only received them graciously, but sent to Athens, according to the promise made by his son, a large present of 150,000 medimni of wheat, with timber sufficient for 100 ships. He at the same time directed Demetrius to convene at Athens a synod of deputies from the allied Grecian cities, where resolutions might be taken for the common interests of Greece[1]. It was his interest at this moment to raise up a temporary self-sustaining authority in Greece, for the purpose of upholding the alliance with himself, during the absence of Demetrius; whom he was compelled to summon into Asia with his army—requiring his services for the war against Ptolemy in Syria and Cyprus.

The following three years were spent by Demetrius—1. In victorious operations near Cyprus, defeating Ptolemy and making himself master of that island; after which Antigonus and Demetrius assumed the title of kings, and the example was followed by Ptolemy, in Egypt—by Lysimachus, in Thrace—and by Seleukus in Babylonia, Mesopotamia, and Syria[2]—thus abolishing even the titular remembrance of Alexander's family. 2. In an unsuccessful invasion of Egypt by land and sea, repulsed with great loss. 3. In the siege of Rhodes. The brave and intelligent citizens of this island re-

chus, and who perished in endeavouring to liberate their country—were also pupils of Plato (Justin, xvi. 5). In fact, aspiring youths, of all varieties of purpose, were likely to seek this mode of improvement. Alexander the Great, too, the very impersonation of subduing force, had been the pupil of Aristotle.

[1] Diodor. xx. 46.

[2] Diodor. xx. 53; Plutarch, Demetr. 18.

sisted for more than a year the most strenuous attacks and the most formidable siege-equipments of Demetrius Poliorketes. All their efforts however would have been vain had they not been assisted by large reinforcements and supplies from Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Kassander. Such are the conditions under which alone even the most resolute and intelligent Greeks can now retain their circumscribed sphere of autonomy. The siege was at length terminated by a compromise; the Rhodians submitted to enrol themselves as allies of Demetrius, yet under proviso not to act against Ptolemy[1]. Towards the latter they carried their grateful devotion so far, as to erect a temple to him, called the Ptolemæum, and to worship him (under the sanction of the oracle of Ammon) as a God[2]. Amidst the rocks and shoals through which Grecian cities were now condemned to steer, menaced on every side by kings more powerful than themselves, and afterwards by the giant-republic of Rome—the Rhodians conducted their political affairs with greater prudence and dignity than any other Grecian city.

B.C. 307-303. His prolonged war, and ultimate success in Greece, against Kassander.

Shortly after the departure of Demetrius from Greece to Cyprus, Kassander and Polysperchon renewed the war in Peloponnesus and its neighbourhood[3]. We make out no particulars respecting this war. The Ætolians were in hostility with Athens, and committed annoying depredations[4]. The

[1] Diodor. XX. 99. Probably this proviso extended also to Lysimachus and Kassander (both of whom had assisted Rhodes) as well as to Ptolemy—though Diodorus does not expressly say so.

[2] Diodor. XX. 100. [3] Diodor. XX. 100.

[4] That the Ætolians were just now most vexatious enemies to Athens,

fleet of Athens, repaired or increased by the timber received from Antigonus, was made to furnish thirty quadriremes to assist Demetrius in Cyprus, and was employed in certain operations near the island of Amorgos, wherein it suffered defeat[1]. But we can discover little respecting the course of the war, except that Kassander gained ground upon the Athenians, and that about the beginning of 303 B.C. he was blockading or threatening to blockade, Athens. The Athenians invoked the aid of Demetrius Poliorketes, who, having recently concluded an accommodation with the Rhodians, came again across from Asia, with a powerful fleet and army, to Aulis in Bœotia[2]. He was received at Athens with demonstrations of honour equal or superior to those which had marked his previous visit. He seems to have passed a year and a half, partly at Athens, partly in military operations carried successfully over many parts of Greece. He compelled the Bœotians to evacuate the Eubœan city of Chalkis, and to relinquish their alliance with Kassander. He drove that prince out of Attica—expelled his garrisons from the two frontier fortresses of Attica,—Phylê and Panaktum—and pursued him as far as Thermopylæ. He captured, or

may be seen by the Ithyphallic ode addressed to Demetrius Poliorketes (Athenæus, vi. p. 253).

[1] Diodor. xx. 50; Plutarch, Demetr. 11. In reference to this defeat near Amorgos, Stratokles (the complaisant orator who moved the votes of flattery towards Demetrius and Antigonus) is said to have announced it first as a victory, to the great joy of the people. Presently evidences of the defeat arrived, and the people were angry with Stratokles. "What harm has happened to you? (replied he)—have you not had two days of pleasure and satisfaction?" This is at any rate a very good story.

[2] Diodor. xx. 100; Plutarch, Demetr. 23.

obtained by bribing the garrisons, the important towns of Corinth, Argos, and Sikyon; mastering also Ægium, Bura, all the Arcadian towns (except Mantineia), and various other towns in Peloponnesus[1]. He celebrated, as president, the great festival of the Heræa at Argos; on which occasion he married Deidameia, sister of Pyrrhus, the young king of Epirus. He prevailed on the Sikyonians to transfer to a short distance the site of their city, conferring upon the new city the name of Demetrias[2]. At a Grecian synod, convened in Corinth under his own letters of invitation, he received by acclamation the appointment of leader or Emperor of the Greeks, as it had been conferred on Philip and Alexander. He even extended his attacks as far as Leukas and Korkyra. The greater part of Greece seems to have been either occupied by his garrisons, or enlisted among his subordinates.

So much was Kassander intimidated by these successes, that he sent envoys to Asia, soliciting peace from Antigonus; who, however, elate and full of arrogance, refused to listen to any terms short of surrender at discretion. Kassander, thus driven to despair, renewed his applications to Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleukus. All these princes felt equally menaced by the power and dispositions of Antigonus—and all resolved upon an energetic combination to put him down[3].

[1] Diodor. xx. 102, 103; Plutarch, Demetr. 23-25.

[2] Diodor. xx. 102; Plutarch, Demetr. 25; Pausanias, ii. 7, 1. The city was withdrawn partially from the sea, and approximated closely to the acropolis. The new city remained permanently; but the new name Demetrias gave place to the old name Sikyon.

[3] Diodor. xx. 106.

B.C. 302–301. Return of Demetrius Poliorketes to Athens—his triumphant reception—memorable Ithyphallic hymn addressed to him.

After uninterrupted prosperity in Greece, throughout the summer of 302 B.C., Demetrius returned from Leukas to Athens, about the month of September, near the time of the Eleusinian mysteries[1]. He was welcomed by festive processions, hymns, pæans, choric dances, and bacchanalian odes of joyous congratulation. One of these hymns is preserved, sung by a chorus of Ithyphalli—masked revellers, with their heads and arms encircled by wreaths,—clothed in white tunics, and in feminine garments reaching almost to the feet[2].

This song is curious, as indicating the hopes and fears prevalent among Athenians of that day, and as affording a measure of their self-appreciation. It is moreover among the latest Grecian documents that we possess, bearing on actual and present reality. The poet, addressing Demetrius as a God, boasts that two of the greatest and best-beloved of all divine beings are visiting Attica at the same moment—Demeter (coming for the season of her mysteries), and Demetrius, son of Poseidon and Aphroditê. "To thee we pray (the hymn proceeds); for other Gods are either afar off—or have no ears—or do not exist—or care nothing about us; but *thee* we see before us, not in wood or marble, but in real presence. First of all things, establish peace; for thou hast the power—and chastise that Sphinx who domineers, not merely over Thebes, but over all Greece—the Ætolian, who (like the old Sphinx) rushes from his station

[1] That he returned from Leukas about the time of these mysteries, is attested both by Demochares and by the Ithyphallic ode in Athenæus, vi. p. 253. See also Duris ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 535.

[2] Semus ap. Athenæum, xiv. p. 622.

on the rock to snatch and carry away our persons, and against whom we cannot fight. At all times the Ætolians robbed their neighbours; but now, they rob far as well as near[1]."

Helpless condition of the Athenians—proclaimed by themselves.

Effusions such as these, while displaying unmeasured idolatry and subservience towards Demetrius, are yet more remarkable, as betraying a loss of force, a senility, and a consciousness of defenceless and degraded position, such as we are astonished to find publicly proclaimed at Athens. It is not only against the foreign potentates that the Athenians avow themselves incapable of self-defence, but even against the incursions of the Ætolians,—Greeks like themselves, though warlike, rude, and restless[2]. When such were the feelings of a people, once the most daring, confident, and organizing—and still the most intelligent—in

[1] Athenæus, vi. p. 253.

Ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοὶ,
ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὦτα,
ἢ οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν αὐδὲ ἓν·
σὲ δὲ παρόνθ' ὁρῶμεν,
οὐ ξύλινον, οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν.
Εὐχόμεσθα δὴ σοί·
πρῶτον μὲν εἰρήνην ποιῆσον, φίλτατε,
κύριος γὰρ εἶ σύ.
Τὴν δ' οὐχὶ Θηβῶν, ἀλλ' ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος,
Σφίγγα περικρατοῦσαν,
Αἰτωλὸς ὅστις ἐπὶ πέτρας καθήμενος,
ὥσπερ ἡ παλαιὰ,
τὰ σώματ' ἡμῶν πάντ' ἀναρπάσας φέρει,
κοὐκ ἔχω μάχεσθαι·
Αἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἁρπάσαι τὰ τῶν πέλας,
νυνὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ πόρρω—
μάλιστα μὲν δὴ κόλασον αὐτὸς· εἰ δὲ μὴ,
Οἰδιποῦν τιν' εὗρε,
τὴν Σφίγγα ταύτην ὅστις ἢ κατακρημνιεῖ,
ἢ σπίνον ποιήσει.

[2] Compare Pausanias, vii. 7, 4.

Greece, we may see that the history of the Greeks as a separate nation or race is reaching its close—and that from henceforward they must become merged in one or other of the stronger currents that surround them.

B.C. 301. Idolatry of Demetrius at Athens. He is initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, out of the regular season.

After his past successes, Demetrius passed some months in enjoyment and luxury at Athens. He was lodged in the Parthenon, being considered as the guest of the Goddess Athênê. But his dissolute habits provoked the louder comments, from being indulged in such a domicile; while the violences which he offered to beautiful youths of good family led to various scenes truly tragical. The subservient manifestations of the Athenians towards him, however, continued unabated. It is even affirmed, that, in order to compensate for something which he had taken amiss, they passed a formal decree, on the proposition of Stratokles, declaring that every thing which Demetrius might command was holy in regard to the Gods and just in regard to men[1]. The banishment of Demochares is said to have been brought on by his sarcastic comments upon this decree[2]. In the month Munychion (April)

[1] Plutarch, Demetr. 24.

[2] Such is the statement of Plutarch (Demetr. 24); but it seems not in harmony with the recital of the honorary decree, passed in 272 B.C., after the death of Demochares, commemorating his merits by a statue, &c. (Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 850). It is there recited that Demochares rendered services to Athens (fortifying and arming the city, concluding peace and alliance with the Bœotians, &c.) ἐπὶ τοῦ τετραετοῦς πολέμου, ἀνθ' ὧν ἐξέπεσεν ὑπὸ τῶν καταλυσάντων τὸν δῆμον. Οἱ καταλύσαντες τὸν δῆμον cannot mean either Demetrius Poliorketes, or Stratokles. Moreover, we cannot determine when the "four years' war," or the alliance with the Bœotians, occurred. Neither the discussion of Mr. Clinton (Fast. H. 302 B.C., and Append. p. 380), nor the different hypothesis of Droysen, are satisfactory on this point—see Carl Müller's

Demetrius mustered his forces and his Grecian allies for a march into Thessaly against Kassander; but before his departure, he was anxious to be initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. It was however not the regular time for this ceremony; the Lesser Mysteries being celebrated in February, the Greater in September. The Athenians overruled the difficulty by passing a special vote, enabling him to be initiated at once, and to receive, in immediate succession, the preparatory and the final initiation, between which ceremonies a year of interval was habitually required. Accordingly, he placed himself disarmed in the hands of the priests, and received both first and second initiation in the month of April, immediately before his departure from Athens[1].

discussion on the fragments of Demochares, Fragm. Hist. Gr. v. ii. p. 446.

[1] Diodor. xx. 110. *παραδοὺς οὖν αὐτὸν ἄνοπλον τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ὡρισμένης ἡμέρας μυηθεὶς, ἀνέζευξεν ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν.*

The account of this transaction in the text is taken from Diodorus, and is a simple one; a vote was passed granting special licence to Demetrius, to receive the mysteries at once, though it was not the appointed season.

Plutarch (Demetr. 26) superadds other circumstances, several of which have the appearance of jest rather than reality. Pythodôrus the Daduch or Torch-bearer of the Mysteries stood alone in his protest against any celebration of the ceremony out of time; this is doubtless very credible. Then (according to Plutarch) the Athenians passed decrees, on the proposition of Stratokles, that the month Munychion should be called Anthesterion. This having been done, the Lesser Mysteries were celebrated, in which Demetrius was initiated. Next, the Athenians passed another decree, to the effect, that the month Munychion should be called Boêdromion—after which, the Greater Mysteries (which belonged to the latter month) were forthwith celebrated. The comic writer Philippides said of Stratokles, that he had compressed the whole year into one single month.

This statement of Plutarch has very much the air of a caricature, by Philippides or some other witty man, of the simple decree mentioned

B.C. 301. March of Demetrius into Thessaly—he passes into Asia and joins Antigonus—great battle of Ipsus, in which the four confederates completely defeat Antigonus, who is slain, and his Asiatic power broken up and partitioned.

Demetrius conducted into Thessaly an army of 56,000 men; of whom 25,000 were Grecian allies—so extensive was his sway at this moment over the Grecian cities[1]. But after two or three months of hostilities, partially successful, against Kassander, he was summoned into Asia by Antigonus to assist in meeting the formidable army of the allies—Ptolemy, Seleukus, Lysimachus, and Kassander. Before retiring from Greece, Demetrius concluded a truce with Kassander, whereby it was stipulated that the Grecian cities, both in Europe and Asia, should be permanently autonomous and free from garrison or control. This stipulation served only as an honourable pretext for leaving Greece; Demetrius had little expectation that it would be observed[2]. In the ensuing spring was fought the decisive battle of Ipsus in Phrygia (B.C. 300), by Antigonus and Demetrius, against Ptolemy, Seleukus, and Lysimachus; with a large army and many elephants on both sides. Antigonus was completely defeated and slain, at the age of more than eighty years. His Asiatic dominion was broken up, chiefly to the profit of Seleukus, whose dynasty became from henceforward ascendent, from the

by Diodorus—a special licence to Demetrius to be initiated out of season. Compare another passage of Philippides against Stratokles (Plutarch, Demetr. 12).

[1] Diodor. xx. 110.

[2] Diodor. xx. 111. It must have been probably during this campaign that Demetrius began or projected the foundation of the important city of Demetrias on the Gulf of Magnesia, which afterwards became one of the great strongholds of the Macedonian ascendency in Greece (Strabo, ix. p. 436-443, in which latter passage, the reference to Hieronymus of Kardia seems to prove that that historian gave a full description of Demetrias and its foundation). See about Demetrias, Mannert, Geogr. Griech. v. vii. p. 591.

coast of Syria eastward to the Caspian Gates and Parthia; sometimes, though imperfectly, farther eastward, nearly to the Indus[1].

B.C. 300. Restoration of the Kassandrian dominion in Greece. Lachares makes himself despot at Athens, under Kassander. Demetrius Poliorketes returns, and expels Lachares. He garrisons Peiræus and Munychia.

The effects of the battle of Ipsus were speedily felt in Greece. The Athenians passed a decree proclaiming themselves neutral, and excluding both the belligerent parties from Attica. Demetrius, retiring with the remnant of his defeated army, and embarking at Ephesus to sail to Athens, was met on the voyage by Athenian envoys, who respectfully acquainted him that he would not be admitted. At the same time, his wife Dëidameia, whom he had left at Athens, was sent away by the Athenians under an honourable escort to Megara, while some ships of war which he had left in the Peiræus were also restored to him. Demetrius, indignant at this unexpected defection of a city which had recently heaped upon him such fulsome adulation, was still farther mortified by the loss of most of his other possessions in Greece[2]. His garrisons were for the most part expelled, and the cities passed into Kassandrian keeping or dominion. His fortunes were indeed partially restored by concluding a peace with Seleukus, who married his daughter. This alliance withdrew Demetrius to Syria, while Greece appears to have fallen more

[1] Mr. Fynes Clinton (Fast. Hell. B.C. 301) places the battle of Ipsus in August 301 B.C.; which appears to me some months earlier than the reality. It is clear from Diodorus, (and indeed from Mr. Clinton's own admission) that winter-quarters in Asia intervened between the departure of Demetrius from Athens in or soon after April 301 B.C., and the battle of Ipsus. Moreover Demetrius, immediately after leaving Athens, carried on many operations against Kassander in Thessaly, before crossing over to Asia to join Antigonus (Diodor. xx. 110, 111).

[2] Plutarch, Demetr. 31.

and more under the Kassandrian parties. It was one of these partisans, Lachares, who, seconded by Kassander's soldiers, acquired a despotism at Athens such as had been possessed by the Phalerean Demetrius, but employed in a manner far more cruel and oppressive. Various exiles driven out by his tyranny invited Demetrius Poliorketes, who passed over again from Asia into Greece, recovered portions of Peloponnesus, and laid siege to Athens. He blocked up the city by sea and land, so that the pressure of famine presently became intolerable. Lachares having made his escape, the people opened their gates to Demetrius, not without great fear of the treatment awaiting them. But he behaved with forbearance, and even with generosity. He spared them all, supplied them with a large donation of corn, and contented himself with taking military occupation of the city, naming his own friends as magistrates. He put garrisons, however, not only into Peiræus and Munychia, but also into the hill called Museum, a part of the walled circle of Athens itself[1] (B.C. 298).

B.C. 298–296. While Demetrius was thus strengthening himself in Greece, he lost all his footing both in Cyprus, Syria, and Kilikia, which passed into the hands of Ptolemy and Seleukus. New prospects however were opened to him in Macedonia by the death of

[1] Plutarch, Demetr. 34, 35; Pausan. i. 25, 5. Pausanias states (i. 26, 2) that a gallant Athenian named Olympiodorus (we do not know when) encouraged his fellow-citizens to attack the Museum, Munychia, and Peiræus; and expelled the Macedonians from all of them. If this be correct, Munychia and Peiræus must have been afterwards reconquered by the Macedonians; for they were garrisoned (as well as Salamis and Sunium) by Antigonus Gonatas (Pausanias, ii. 8, 5; Plutarch, Aratus, 34).

Kassander (his brother-in-law, brother of his wife Phila) and the family-feuds supervening thereupon. Philippus, eldest son of Kassander, succeeded his father, but died of sickness after something more than a year. Between the two remaining sons, Antipater and Alexander, a sanguinary hostility broke out. Antipater slew his mother Thessalonikê, and threatened the life of his brother, who in his turn invited aid both from Demetrius, and from the Epirotic king Pyrrhus. Pyrrhus being ready first, marched into Macedonia, and expelled Antipater; receiving as his recompense the territory called Tymphæa (between Epirus and Macedonia), together with Akarnania, Amphilochia, and the town of Ambrakia, which became henceforward his chief city and residence[1]. Antipater sought shelter in Thrace with his father-in-law Lysimachus; by whose order, however, he was presently slain. Demetrius, occupied with other matters, was more tardy in obeying the summons; but, on entering into Macedonia, he found himself strong enough to dispossess and kill Alexander (who had indeed invited him, but is said to have laid a train for assassinating him), and seized the Macedonian crown; not without the assent of a considerable party, to whom the name and the deeds of Kassander and his sons were alike odious[2].

Death of Kassander. Bloody feuds among his family. Demetrius acquires the crown of Macedonia.

Demetrius became thus master of Macedonia, B.C. 294. together with the greater part of Greece, including Athens, Megara, and much of Peloponnesus. He

[1] Plutarch, Pyrrhus, 6.

[2] Plutarch, Demetr. 36; Dexippus ap. Syncell. p. 264 *seq.*; Pausan. ix. 7, 3; Justin, xvi. 1, 2.

Antigonus Gonatas, son of Demetrius, master of Macedonia and Greece. Permanent footing of the Antigonid dynasty in Macedonia, until the conquest of that country by the Romans.

undertook an expedition into Bœotia, for the purpose of conquering Thebes; in which attempt he succeeded, not without a double siege of that city, which made an obstinate resistance. He left as viceroy in Bœotia the historian, Hieronymus of Kardia[1], once the attached friend and fellow-citizen of Eumenes. But Greece as a whole was managed by Antigonus (afterwards called Antigonus Gonatas) son of Demetrius, who maintained his supremacy unshaken during all his father's lifetime; even though Demetrius was deprived of Macedonia by the temporary combination of Lysimachus with Pyrrhus, and afterwards remained (until his death in 283 B.C.) a captive in the hands of Seleukus. After a brief possession of the crown of Macedonia successively by Seleukus, Ptolemy Keraunus, Meleager, Antipater, and Sosthenes—Antigonus Gonatas regained it in 277 B.C. His descendants the Antigonid kings maintained it until the battle of Pydna in 168 B.C.; when Perseus, the last of them, was overthrown, and his kingdom incorporated with the Roman conquests[2].

Spirit of the Greeks broken—isolation of the cities from each other by Antigonus.

Of Greece during this period we can give no account, except that the greater number of its cities were in dependence upon Demetrius and his son Antigonus; either under occupation by Macedonian garrisons, or ruled by local despots who leaned on foreign mercenaries and Macedonian support. The spirit of the Greeks was broken, and their habits of combined sentiment and action

[1] Plutarch, Demetr. 39.

[2] See Mr. Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, Append. 4. p. 236-239.

had disappeared.' The invasion of the Gauls indeed awakened them into a temporary union for the defence of Thermopylæ in 279 B.C. So intolerable was the cruelty and spoliation of those barbarian invaders, that the cities as well as Antigonus were driven by fear to the efforts necessary for repelling them[1]. A gallant army of Hellenic confederates was mustered. In the mountains of Ætolia and in the neighbourhood of Delphi, most of the Gallic horde with their king Brennus perished. But this burst of spirit did not interrupt the continuance of the Macedonian dominion in Greece, which Antigonus Gonatas continued to hold throughout most of a long reign. He greatly extended the system begun by his predecessors, of isolating each Grecian city from alliances with other cities in its neighbourhood—planting in most of them local despots—and compressing the most important by means of garrisons[2]. Among all Greeks, the Spartans and the Ætolians stood most free from foreign occupation, and were the least crippled in their power of self-action. The Achæan league too developed itself afterwards as a renovated sprout from the ruined tree of Grecian liberty[3], though never attaining to anything better

[1] Pausanias, i. 4, 1; x. 20, 1. Τοῖς δέ γε Ἕλλησι κατεπεπτώκει μὲν ἐς ἅπαν τὰ φρονήματα, τὸ δὲ ἰσχυρὸν τοῦ δείματος προῆγεν ἐς ἀνάγκην τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀμύνειν· ἑώρων δὲ τόν τε ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἀγῶνα, οὐκ ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας γενησόμενον, κάθα ἐπὶ τοῦ Μήδου πότε.....ὡς οὖν ἀπολωλέναι δέον ἢ ἐπικρατεστέρους εἶναι, κατ' ἄνδρα τε ἰδία καὶ αἱ πόλεις διέκειντο ἐν κοινῷ. (On the approach of the invading Gauls.)

[2] Polyb. ii. 40, 41. πλείστους γὰρ δὴ μονάρχους οὗτος (Antigonus Gonatas) ἐμφυτεῦσαι δοκεῖ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Justin, xxvi. 1.

[3] Pausanias, vii. 17, 1. Ἄτε ἐκ δένδρου λελωβημένου, ἀνεβλάστησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ Ἀχαϊκόν.

than a feeble and puny life, nor capable of sustaining itself without foreign aid[1].

The Greece of Polybius cannot form a subject of history by itself, but is essentially dependent on foreign neighbours.

With this after-growth, or half-revival, I shall not meddle. It forms the Greece of Polybius, which that author treats, in my opinion justly, as having no history of its own[2], but as an appendage attached to some foreign centre and principal among its neighbours—Macedonia, Egypt, Syria, Rome. Each of these neighbours acted upon the destinies of Greece more powerfully than the Greeks themselves. The Greeks to whom these volumes have been devoted —those of Homer, Archilochus, Solon, Æschylus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Demosthenes—present as their most marked characteristic a loose aggregation of autonomous tribes or communities, acting and reacting freely among themselves, with little or no pressure from foreigners. The main interest of the narrative has consisted in the spontaneous grouping of the different Hellenic fractions—in the self-prompted cooperations and conflicts—the abortive attempts to bring about something like an effective federal organization, or to maintain two permanent rival confederacies—the energetic ambition, and heroic endurance, of men to whom Hellas was the entire political world. The freedom of Hellas, the life and soul of this history from its commencement, disappeared completely during the first years of Alexander's reign. After following to their tombs the generation of Greeks contemporary with him,

[1] Plutarch, Aratus, 47. *ἐθισθέντες γὰρ ἀλλοτρίαις σώζεσθαι χερσὶν, καὶ τοῖς Μακεδόνων ὅπλοις αὐτοὺς ὑπεσταλκότες* (the Achæans), &c. Compare also c. 12, 13, 15, in reference to the earlier applications to Ptolemy king of Egypt.

[2] Polybius, i. 3, 4; ii. 37.

men like Demosthenes and Phokion, born in a state of freedom—I have pursued the history into that gulf of Grecian nullity which marks the succeeding century; exhibiting sad evidence of the degrading servility, and suppliant king-worship, into which the countrymen of Aristeides and Perikles had been driven, by their own conscious weakness under overwhelming pressure from without.

Evidence of the political nullity of Athens—public decree in honour of Democharès—what acts are recorded as his titles to public gratitude.

I cannot better complete that picture than by showing what the leading democratical citizen became, under the altered atmosphere which now bedimmed his city. Democharès, the nephew of Demosthenes, has been mentioned as one of the few distinguished Athenians in this last generation. He was more than once chosen to the highest public offices[1]; he was conspicuous for his free speech, both as an orator and as an historian, in the face of powerful enemies; he remained throughout a long life faithfully attached to the democratical constitution, and was banished for a time by its opponents. In the year 280 B.C., he prevailed on the Athenians to erect a public monument, with a commemorative inscription, to his uncle Demosthenes. Seven or eight years afterwards, Democharès himself died, aged nearly eighty. His son Laches proposed and obtained a public decree, that a statue should be erected, with an annexed inscription, to his honour. We read in the decree a recital of the distinguished public services, whereby Democharès merited this compliment from his countrymen. All that the proposer of the decree, his son and fellow-citizen, can find to recite, as en-

[1] Polybius, xii. 13.

nobling the last half of the father's public life (since his return from exile), is as follows:—1. He contracted the public expenses, and introduced a more frugal management. 2. He undertook an embassy to King Lysimachus, from whom he obtained two presents for the people, one of thirty talents, the other of one hundred talents. 3. He proposed the vote for sending envoys to King Ptolemy in Egypt, from whom fifty talents were obtained for the people. 4. He went as envoy to Antipater, received from him twenty talents, and delivered them to the people at the Eleusinian festival[1].

When such begging missions are the deeds, for which Athens both employed and recompensed her most eminent citizens, an historian accustomed to the Grecian world as described by Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, feels that the life has departed from his subject, and with sadness and humiliation brings his narrative to a close.

[1] See the decree in Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 850. The Antipater here mentioned is the son of Kassander, not the father. There is no necessity for admitting the conjecture of Mr. Clinton (Fast. Hell. App. p. 380) that the name ought to be *Antigonus*, and not *Antipater*; although it may perhaps be true that Demochares was on favourable terms with Antigonus Gonatas (Diog. Laert. vii. 14).

Compare Carl Müller ad. Democharis Fragm. apud Fragm. Hist. Græc. vol. ii. p. 446, ed. Didot.

CHAPTER XCVII.

SICILIAN AND ITALIAN GREEKS.—AGATHOKLES.

Constitution established by Timoleon at Syracuse—exchanged for an oligarchy.

It has been convenient, throughout all this work, to keep the history of the Italian and Sicilian Greeks distinct from that of the Central and Asiatic. We parted last from the Sicilian Greeks[1], at the death of their champion the Corinthian Timoleon (337 B.C.), by whose energetic exploits, and generous political policy, they had been almost regenerated—rescued from foreign enemies, protected against intestine discord, and invigorated by a large reinforcement of new colonists. For the twenty years next succeeding the death of Timoleon, the history of Syracuse and Sicily is an absolute blank; which is deeply to be regretted, since the position of these cities included so much novelty—so many subjects for debate, for peremptory settlement, or for amicable compromise—that the annals of their proceedings must have been peculiarly interesting. Twenty years after the death of Timoleon, we find the government of Syracuse described as an oligarchy; implying that the constitution established by Timoleon must have been changed either by violence or by consent. The oligarchy is stated as consisting of 600 chief men, among whom Sosistratus and Herakleides appear as leaders[2]. We hear generally that the Syracusans had been engaged in wars, and

[1] See my last preceding Vol. XI. Ch. lxxxv. p. 277.

[2] Diodor. xix. 3. It appears that Diodorus had recounted in his

that Sosistratus either first originated, or first firmly established, his oligarchy, after an expedition undertaken to the coast of Italy, to assist the citizens of Kroton against their interior neighbours and assailants the Bruttians.

Italian Greeks—pressed upon by enemies from the interior—Archidamus king of Sparta slain in Italy.

Not merely Kroton, but other Grecian cities also on the coast of Italy, appear to have been exposed to causes of danger and decline, similar to those which were operating upon so many other portions of the Hellenic world. Their non-Hellenic neighbours in the interior were growing too powerful and too aggressive to leave them in peace or security. The Messapians, the Lucanians, the Bruttians, and other native Italian tribes, were acquiring that increased strength which became ultimately all concentrated under the mighty republic of Rome. I have in my preceding volume recounted the acts of the two Syracusan despots, the elder and younger Dionysius, on this Italian coast[1]. Though the elder gained some advantage over the Lucanians, yet the interference of both contributed only to enfeeble and humiliate the Italiot Greeks. Not long before the battle of Chæroneia (340–338 B.C.), the Tarentines found themselves so hard pressed by the Messapians, that they sent to Sparta, their mother-city, to entreat assistance. The Spartan king Archidamus son of Agesilaus, perhaps ashamed of the nullity of his country since the close of the Sacred War, complied with their prayer, and sailed at the head of a mercenary force to Italy. How long his

eighteenth Book the previous circumstances of these two leaders; but this part of his narrative is lost: see Wesseling's note.

[1] See Vol. XI. Ch. lxxxiii. p. 30; Ch. lxxxv. p. 187.

operations there lasted, we do not know; but they ended by his being defeated and killed, near the time of the battle of Chæroneia[1] (338 B.C.).

Rise of the Molossian kingdom of Epirus by Macedonian aid—Alexander the Molossian king, brother of Olympias.

About six years after this event, the Tarentines, being still pressed by the same formidable neighbours, invoked the aid of the Epirotic Alexander, king of the Molossians, and brother of Olympias. These Epirots now, during the general decline of Grecian force, rise into an importance which they had never before enjoyed[2]. Philip of Macedon, having married Olympias, not only secured his brother-in-law on the Molossian throne, but strengthened his authority over subjects not habitually obedient. It was through Macedonian interference that the Molossian Alexander first obtained (though subject to Macedonian ascendency) the important city of Ambrakia; which thus passed out of a free Hellenic community into the capital and seaport of the Epirotic kings. Alexander farther cemented his union with Macedonia by marrying his own niece Kleopatra, daughter of Philip and Olympias. In fact, during the lives of Philip and Alexander the Great, the Epirotic kingdom appears a sort of adjunct to the Macedonian; governed by Olympias either jointly with her brother the Molossian Alexander—or as regent after his death[3].

[1] Diodor. xvi. 88; Plutarch, Camill. 19; Pausan. iii. 10, 5. Plutarch even says that the two battles occurred on the same *day*.

[2] The Molossian King Neoptolemus was father both of Alexander (the Epirotic) and of Olympias. But as to the genealogy of the preceding kings, nothing certain can be made out: see Merleker, Darstellung des Landes und der Bewohner von Epeiros, Königsberg, 1844, p. 2-6.

[3] A curious proof how fully Olympias was queen of Epirus is preserved in the fragments (recently published by Mr. Babington) of the

B.C. 332–331. The Molossian Alexander crosses into Italy to assist the Tarentines. His exploits and death.

It was about the year after the battle of Issus that the Molossian Alexander undertook his expedition into Italy[1]; doubtless instigated in part by emulation of the Asiatic glories of his nephew and namesake. Though he found enemies more formidable than the Persians at Issus, yet his success was at first considerable. He gained victories over the Messapians, the Lucanians, and the Samnites; he conquered the Lucanian town of Consentia, and the Bruttian town of Tereina; he established an alliance with the Pœdiculi, and exchanged friendly messages with the Romans. As far as we can make out from scanty data, he seems to have calculated on establishing a comprehensive dominion in the south

oration of Hyperides in defence of Euxenippus, p. 12. The Athenians, in obedience to an oracular mandate from the Dodonæan Zeus, had sent to Dodona a solemn embassy for sacrifice, and had dressed and adorned the statue of Diônê there situated. Olympias addressed a despatch to the Athenians, reproving them for this as a trespass upon her dominions—*ὑπὲρ τούτων ὑμῖν τὰ ἐγκλήματα ἦλθε παρ' Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, ὡς ἡ χώρα εἴη ἡ Μολοσσία αὐτῆς, ἐν ᾗ τὸ ἱερόν ἐστιν· οὔκουν προσῆκεν ἡμῖν τῶν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ ἓν κινεῖν.* Olympias took a high and insolent tone in this letter (*τὰς τραγῳδίας αὐτῆς καὶ τὰς κατηγορίας*, &c.).

The date of this oration is at some period during the life of Alexander the Great—but cannot be more precisely ascertained. After the death of Alexander, Olympias passed much time in Epirus, where she thought herself more secure from the enmity of Antipater (Diodor. xviii. 49).

Dodona had been one of the most ancient places of pilgrimage for the Hellenic race—especially for the Athenians. The order here addressed to them,—that they should abstain from religious manifestations at this sanctuary—is a remarkable proof of the growing encroachments on free Hellenism; the more so, as Olympias sent offerings to temples at Athens when she chose and without asking permission—we learn this from the same fragment of Hyperides.

[1] Livy (viii. 3–24) places the date of this expedition of the Molossian Alexander eight years earlier; but it is universally recognized that this is a mistake.

of Italy, over all its population—over Greek cities, Lucanians, and Bruttians. He demanded and obtained three hundred of the chief Lucanian and Messapian families, whom he sent over as hostages to Epirus. Several exiles of these nations joined him as partisans. He farther endeavoured to transfer the congress of the Greco-Italian cities, which had been usually held at the Tarentine colony of Herakleia, to Thurii; intending probably to procure for himself a compliant synod like that serving the purpose of his Macedonian nephew at Corinth. But the tide of his fortune at length turned. The Tarentines became disgusted and alarmed; his Lucanian partisans proved faithless; the stormy weather in the Calabrian Apennines broke up the communication between his different detachments, and exposed them to be cut off in detail. He himself perished, by the hands of a Lucanian exile, in crossing the river Acheron, and near the town of Pandosia. This was held to be a memorable attestation of the prophetic veracity of the oracle; since he had received advice from Dodona to beware of Pandosia and Acheron; two names which he well knew, and therefore avoided, in Epirus—but which he had not before known to exist in Italy[1].

Assistance sent by the Syracusans to Kroton—first rise of Agathokles.

The Greco-Italian cities had thus dwindled down into a prize to be contended for between the Epirotic kings and the native Italian powers—as they again became, still more conspicuously, fifty years afterwards, during the war between Pyrrhus and the Romans. They were now left to seek foreign aid, where they could obtain it, and to become the prey

[1] Livy, viii. 17-24; Justin, xii. 2; Strabo, vi. p. 280.

of adventurers. It is in this capacity that we hear of them as receiving assistance from Syracuse; and that the formidable name of Agathokles first comes before us—seemingly about 320 B.C.[1] The Syracusan force, sent to Italy to assist the Krotoniates against their enemies the Bruttians, was commanded by a general named Antander, whose brother Agathokles served with him in a subordinate command.

To pass over the birth and childhood of Agathokles —respecting which, romantic anecdotes are told, as about most eminent men—it appears that his father, a Rhegine exile named Karkinus, came from Therma (in the Carthaginian portion of Sicily) to settle at Syracuse, at the time when Timoleon invited and received new Grecian settlers to the citizenship of the latter city. Karkinus was in comparative poverty, following the trade of a potter; which his son Agathokles learnt also, being about eighteen years of age when domiciliated with his father at Syracuse[2]. Though starting from this humble beginning, and even notorious for the profligacy and rapacity of his youthful habits, Agathokles soon attained a conspicuous position, partly from his own superior personal qualities, partly from the favour of a wealthy Syracusan named Damas. The young potter was handsome, tall, and of gigantic strength; he performed with distinction the military service required from him as a citizen, wearing a panoply so heavy, that no other soldier could fight with it; he was moreover ready, audacious, and emphatic in public harangue. Damas became much attached

[1] Diodor. xix. 3.

[2] Timæus apud Polybium, xii. 15; Diodor. xix. 2.

to him, and not only supplied him profusely with money, but also, when placed in command of a Syracusan army against the Agrigentines, nominated him one of the subordinate officers. In this capacity Agathokles acquired great reputation, for courage in battle, ability in command, and fluency of speech. Presently Damas died of sickness, leaving a widow without children. Agathokles married the widow, and thus raised himself to a high fortune and position in Syracuse[1].

Agathokles distinguishes himself in the Syracusan expedition—he is disappointed of honours—becomes discontented and leaves Syracuse.

Of the oligarchy which now prevailed at Syracuse, we have no particulars, nor do we know how it had come to be substituted for the more popular forms established by Timoleon. We hear only generally that the oligarchical leaders, Sosistratus and Herakleides, were unprincipled and sanguinary men[2]. By this government an expedition was despatched from Syracuse to the Italian coast, to assist the inhabitants of Kroton against their aggressive neighbours the Bruttians. Antander, brother of Agathokles, was one of the generals commanding this armament, and Agathokles himself served in it as a subordinate officer. We neither know the date, the duration, nor the issue, of this expedition. But it afforded a fresh opportunity to Agathokles to display his adventurous bravery and military genius, which procured for him high encomium. He was supposed by some, on his return to Syracuse, to be entitled to the first prize for

[1] Diodor. xix. 3; Justin, xxii. 1. Justin states the earliest military exploits of Agathokles to have been against the Ætuæans, not against the Agrigentines.

[2] Diodor. xix. 3, 4. Diodorus had written more about this oligarchy in a part of his eighteenth book; which part is not preserved: see Wesseling's note.

valour; but Sosistratus and the other oligarchical leaders withheld it from him and preferred another. So deeply was Agathokles incensed by this refusal, that he publicly inveighed against them among the people, as men aspiring to despotism. His opposition being unsuccessful, and drawing upon him the enmity of the government, he retired to the coast of Italy.

He levies a mercenary force—his exploits as general in Italy and Sicily.

Here he levied a military band of Grecian exiles and Campanian mercenaries, which he maintained by various enterprises for or against the Grecian cities. He attacked Kroton, but was repulsed with loss; he took service with the Tarentines, fought for some time against their enemies, but at length became suspected and dismissed; he then joined himself with the inhabitants of Rhegium, assisting in the defence of the town against a Syracusan aggression. He even made two attempts to obtain admission by force into Syracuse, and to seize the government[1]. Though repulsed in both of them, he nevertheless contrived to maintain a footing in Sicily, was appointed general at the town of Morgantium, and captured Leontini, within a short distance north of Syracuse. Some time afterwards, a revolution took place at Syracuse, whereby Sosistratus and the oligarchy were dispossessed and exiled with many of their partisans.

Under the new government, Agathokles obtained his recall, and soon gained increased ascendency. The dispossessed exiles contrived to raise forces,

[1] Diodor. xix. 4; Justin, xxii. 1. "Bis occupare imperium Syracusarum voluit; bis in exilium actus est."

In the same manner, the Syracusan exile Hermokrates had attempted to extort by force his return, at the head of 3000 men, and by means of partisans within; he failed and was slain—B.C. 408 (Diodor. xiii. 75).

and to carry on a formidable war against Syracuse from without; they even obtained assistance from the Carthaginians, so as to establish themselves at Gela, on the southern confines of the Syracusan territory. In the military operations thus rendered necessary, Agathokles took a forward part, distinguishing himself among the ablest and most enterprising officers. He tried, with 1000 soldiers, to surprise Gela by night; but finding the enemy on their guard, he was repulsed with loss and severely wounded; yet by an able manœuvre he brought off all his remaining detachment. Though thus energetic against the public enemy, however, he at the same time inspired both hatred and alarm for his dangerous designs, to the Syracusans within. The Corinthian Akestorides, who had been named general of the city—probably from recollection of the distinguished services formerly rendered by the Corinthian Timoleon—becoming persuaded that the presence of Agathokles was full of peril to the city, ordered him to depart, and provided men to assassinate him on the road during the night. But Agathokles, suspecting their design, disguised himself in the garb of a beggar, appointing another man to travel in the manner which would be naturally expected from himself. This substitute was slain in the dark by the assassins, while Agathokles escaped by favour of his disguise. He and his partisans appear to have found shelter with the Carthaginians in Sicily[1].

Change of government at Syracuse —Agathokles is recalled—his exploits against the exiles—his dangerous character at home.

[1] Diodor. xix. 5, 6. A similar stratagem is recounted of the Karian Datames (Cornelius Nepos, Datames, 9).

That Agathokles, on leaving Syracuse, went to the Carthaginians, appears to be implied in the words of Diodorus, c. 6—τοὺς αὐτῷ πρότε-

Farther internal changes at Syracuse—recall of the exiles—Agathokles re-admitted—swears amnesty and fidelity.

Not long afterwards, another change took place in the government of Syracuse, whereby the oligarchical exiles were recalled, and peace made with the Carthaginians. It appears that a senate of 600 was again installed as the chief political body; probably not the same men as before, and with some democratical modifications. At the same time, negotiations were opened, through the mediation of the Carthaginian commander Hamilkar, between the Syracusans and Agathokles. The mischiefs of intestine conflict, amidst the numerous discordant parties in the city, pressed hard upon every one, and hopes were entertained that all might be brought to agree in terminating them. Agathokles affected to enter cordially into these projects of amnesty and reconciliation. The Carthaginian general Hamilkar, who had so recently aided Sosistratus and the Syracusan oligarchy, now did his best to promote the recall of Agathokles, and even made himself responsible for the good and pacific behaviour of that exile. Agathokles, and the other exiles along with him were accordingly restored. A public assembly was convened in the temple of Demeter, in the presence of Hamilkar; where Agathokles swore by the most awful oaths, with his hands touching the altar and statue of the goddess, that he would behave as a good citizen of Syracuse, uphold faithfully the existing government, and carry out the engagements of the Carthaginian mediators—abstaining

ρον συμπορευθέντας πρὸς Καρχηδονίους (see Wesseling's note on the translation of πρὸς). This fact is noticed merely incidentally, in the confused narrative of Diodorus; but it brings him to a certain extent into harmony with Justin (xxii. 2), who insists much on the combination between Agathokles and the Carthaginians, as one of the main helps whereby he was enabled to seize the supreme power.

from encroachments on the rights and possessions of Carthage in Sicily. His oaths and promises were delivered with so much apparent sincerity, accompanied by emphatic harangues, that the people were persuaded to name him general and guardian of the peace, for the purpose of realising the general aspirations towards harmony. Such appointment was recommended (it seems) by Hamilkar[1].

Agathokles, in collusion with Hamilkar, arms his partisans at Syracuse, and perpetrates a sanguinary massacre of the citizens.

All this train of artifice had been concerted by Agathokles with Hamilkar, for the purpose of enabling the former to seize the supreme power. As general of the city, Agathokles had the direction of the military force. Under pretence of marching against some refractory exiles at Erbita in the interior, he got together 3000 soldiers strenuously devoted to him—mercenaries and citizens of desperate character—to which Hamilkar added a reinforcement of Africans. As if about to march forth, he mustered his troops at daybreak in the Timoleonteon (chapel or precinct consecrated to Timoleon), while Peisarchus and Dekles, two chiefs of the senate already assembled, were invited with forty others to transact with him some closing business.

[1] The account here given is the best which I can make out from Diodorus (xix. 5), Justin (xxii. 2),—Polyænus (v. 3. 8). The first two allude to the solemn oath taken by Agathokles—*παραχθεὶς εἰς τὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν, ὥμοσε μηδὲν ἐναντιωθήσεσθαι τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ*—"Tunc Hamilcari expositis ignibus Cereris tactisque in obsequia Pœnorum jurat." "Jurare in obsequia Pœnorum" can hardly be taken to mean that Syracuse was to become subject to Carthage; there was nothing antecedent to justify such a proceeding, nor does anything follow in the sequel which implies it.

Compare also the speech which Justin puts into the mouth of Bomilkar when executed for treason by the Carthaginians—"objectans illis (Carthaginiensibus) in Hamilcarem patruum suum tacita suffragia, quod Agathoclem *socium illis facere, quam hostem, maluerit*" (xxii. 7). This points to previous collusion between Hamilkar and Agathokles.

Having these men in his power, Agathokles suddenly turned upon them, and denounced them to the soldiers as guilty of conspiring his death. Then, receiving from the soldiers a response full of ardour, he ordered them immediately to proceed to a general massacre of the senate and their leading partisans, with full permission of licentious plunder in the houses of these victims, the richest men in Syracuse. The soldiers rushed into the streets with ferocious joy to execute this order. They slew not only the senators, but many others also, unarmed and unprepared; each man selecting victims personally obnoxious to him. They broke open the doors of the rich, or climbed over the roofs, massacred the proprietors within, and ravished the females. They chased the unsuspecting fugitives through the streets, not sparing even those who took refuge in the temples. Many of these unfortunate sufferers rushed for safety to the gates, but found them closed and guarded by special order of Agathokles; so that they were obliged to let themselves down from the walls, in which many perished miserably. For two days Syracuse was thus a prey to the sanguinary, rapacious, and lustful impulses of the soldiery; four thousand citizens had been already slain, and many more were seized as prisoners. The political purposes of Agathokles, as well as the passions of the soldiers, being then sated, he arrested the massacre. He concluded this bloody feat by killing such of his prisoners as were most obnoxious to him, and banishing the rest. The total number of expelled or fugitive Syracusans is stated at 6000; who found a hospitable shelter and

home at Agrigentum. One act of lenity is mentioned, and ought not to be omitted amidst this scene of horror. Deinokrates, one among the prisoners, was liberated by Agathokles from motives of former friendship: he too, probably, went into voluntary exile[1].

Agathokles is constituted sole despot of Syracuse.

After a massacre thus perpetrated in the midst of profound peace, and in the full confidence of a solemn act of mutual reconciliation immediately preceding—surpassing the worst deeds of the elder Dionysius, and indeed (we might almost say) of all other Grecian despots—Agathokles convened what he called an assembly of the people. Such of the citizens as were either oligarchical, or wealthy, or in any way unfriendly to him, had been already either slain or expelled; so that the assembly probably included few besides his own soldiers: Agathokles, addressing them in terms of congratulation on the recent glorious exploit, whereby they had purged the city of its oligarchical tyrants — proclaimed that the Syracusan people had now reconquered their full liberty. He affected to be weary of the toils of command, and anxious only for a life of quiet equality as one among the many; in token of which he threw off his general's cloak and put on a common civil garment. But those whom he addressed, fresh from the recent massacre and plunder, felt that their whole security depended upon the maintenance of his supremacy, and loudly protested that they would not accept his resignation. Agathokles, with pretended reluctance, told them, that if they insisted, he would comply, but upon the peremptory con-

[1] Diodor. xix. 8, 9; Justin, xxii. 2.

dition of enjoying a single-handed authority, without any colleagues or counsellors for whose misdeeds he was to be responsible. The assembly replied by conferring upon him, with unanimous acclamations, the post of general with unlimited power, or despot[1].

B.C. 317. His popular manners, military energy, and conquests.

Thus was constituted a new despot of Syracuse about fifty years after the decease of the elder Dionysius, and twenty-two years after Timoleon had rooted out the Dionysian dynasty, establishing on its ruins a free polity. On accepting the post, Agathokles took pains to proclaim that he would tolerate no farther massacre or plunder, and that his government would for the future be mild and beneficent. He particularly studied to conciliate the poorer citizens, to whom he promised abolition of debts and a new distribution of lands. How far he carried out this project systematically, we do not know; but he conferred positive donations on many of the poor—which he had abundant means of doing, out of the properties of the numerous exiles recently expelled. He was full of promises to every one, displaying courteous and popular manners, and abstaining from all ostentation of guards, or ceremonial attendants, or a diadem. He at the same time applied himself vigorously to strengthen his military and naval force, his magazines of arms and stores, and his revenues. He speedily extended his authority over all the territorial domain of Syracuse, with her subject towns, and carried his arms successfully over many other parts of Sicily[2].

[1] Diodor. xix. 9.

[2] Diodor. xix. 9; Justin, xxii. 2.

B.C. 317–310. Progress of Agathokles in conquering Sicily. The Agrigentines take alarm and organize a defensive alliance against him.

The Carthaginian general Hamilkar, whose complicity or connivance had helped Agathokles to this blood-stained elevation, appears to have permitted him without opposition to extend his dominion over a large portion of Sicily, and even to plunder the towns in alliance with Carthage itself. Complaints having been made to Carthage, this officer was superseded, and another general (also named Hamilkar) was sent in his place. We are unable to trace in detail the proceedings of Agathokles during the first years of his despotism; but he went on enlarging his sway over the neighbouring cities, while the Syracusan exiles, whom he had expelled, found a home partly at Agrigentum (under Deinokrates), partly at Messênê. About the year 314 B.C., we hear that he made an attempt on Messênê, which he was on the point of seizing, had he not been stopped by the interference of the Carthaginians (perhaps the newly-appointed Hamilkar), who now at length protested against his violation of the convention; meaning (as we must presume, for we know of no other convention) the oath which had been sworn by Agathokles at Syracuse under the guarantee of the Carthaginians[1]. Though thus disappointed at Messênê, Agathokles seized Abakænum—where he slew the leading citizens opposed to him,—and carried on his aggressions elsewhere

[1] Diodor. xix. 65. *καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον ἦκον ἐκ Καρχηδόνος πρέσβεις, οἱ τῷ μὲν Ἀγαθοκλεῖ περὶ τῶν πραχθέντων ἐπετίμησαν, ὡς παραβαίνοντι τὰς ξυνθήκας· τοῖς δὲ Μεσσηνίοις εἰρήνην παρεσκεύασαν, καὶ τὸ φρούριον ἀναγκάσαντες ἀποκαταστῆσαι τὸν τύραννον, ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν Λιβύην.*

I do not know what *συνθῆκαι* can be here meant, except that oath described by Justin under the words "in obsequia Pœnorum jurat" (xxii. 2).

so effectively, that the leaders at Agrigentum, instigated by the Syracusan exiles there harboured, became convinced of the danger of leaving such encroachments unresisted[1]. The people of Agrigentum came to the resolution of taking up arms on behalf of the liberties of Sicily, and allied themselves with Gela and Messênê for the purpose.

They invite the Spartan Akrotatus to command—his bad conduct and failure.

But the fearful example of Agathokles himself rendered them so apprehensive of the dangers from any military leader, at once native and energetic, that they resolved to invite a foreigner. Some Syracusan exiles were sent to Sparta, to choose and invoke some Spartan of eminence and ability, as Archidamus had recently been called to Tarentum—and even more, as Timoleon had been brought from Corinth, with results so signally beneficent. The old Spartan king Kleomenes (of the Eurysthenid race) had a son Akrotatus, then unpopular at home[2], and well disposed towards foreign warfare. This prince, without even consulting the Ephors, listened at once to the envoys, and left Peloponnesus with a small squadron, intending to cross by Korkyra and the coast of Italy to Agrigentum. Unfavourable winds drove him as far north as Apol-

[1] Diodor. xix. 70. μὴ περιορᾷν Ἀγαθοκλέα συσκευαζόμενον τὰς πόλεις.

[2] Diodor. xix. 70. After the defeat of Agis by Antipater, the severe Lacedæmonian laws against those who fled from battle had been suspended for the occasion; as had been done before, after the defeat of Leuktra. Akrotatus had been the *only* person (μόνος) who opposed this suspension; whereby he incurred the most violent odium generally, but most especially from the citizens who profited by the suspension. These men carried their hatred so far, that they even attacked, beat him, and conspired against his life (οὗτοι γὰρ συστραφέντες πληγάς τε ἐνεφύρησαν αὐτῷ καὶ διετέλουν ἐπιβουλεύοντες).

This is a curious indication of Spartan manners.

lonia, and delayed his arrival at Tarentum; in which city, originally a Spartan colony, he met with a cordial reception, and obtained a vote of twenty vessels to assist his enterprize of liberating Syracuse from Agathokles. He reached Agrigentum with favourable hopes, was received with all the honours due to a Spartan prince, and undertook the command. Bitterly did he disappoint his party. He was incompetent as a general; he dissipated in presents or luxuries the money intended for the campaign, emulating Asiatic despots; his conduct was arrogant, tyrannical, and even sanguinary. The disgust which he inspired was brought to a height, when he caused Sosistratus, the leader of the Syracusan exiles, to be assassinated at a banquet. Immediately the exiles rose in a body to avenge this murder; while Akrotatus, deposed by the Agrigentines, only found safety in flight[1].

Sicily the only place in which a glorious Hellenic career was open.

To this young Spartan prince, had he possessed a noble heart and energetic qualities, there was here presented a career of equal grandeur with that of Timoleon—against an enemy able indeed and formidable, yet not so superior in force as to render success impossible. It is melancholy to see Akrotatus, from simple worthlessness of character, throwing away such an opportunity; at a time when Sicily was the only soil on which a glorious Hellenic career was still open—when no similar exploits were practicable by any Hellenic leader in Central Greece, from the overwhelming superiority of force possessed by the surrounding kings.

The misconduct of Akrotatus broke up all hopes

[1] Diodor. xix. 71.

Peace concluded by Agathokles with the Agrigentines—his great power in Sicily.

of active operations against Agathokles. Peace was presently concluded with the latter by the Agrigentines and their allies, under the mediation of the Carthaginian general Hamilkar. By the terms of this convention, all the Greek cities in Sicily were declared autonomous, yet under the hegemony of Agathokles; excepting only Himera, Selinus, and Herakleia, which were actually, and were declared still to continue, under Carthage. Messênê was the only Grecian city standing aloof from this convention; as such, therefore still remaining open to the Syracusan exiles. The terms were so favourable to Agathokles, that they were much disapproved at Carthage[1]. Agathokles, recognized as chief and having no enemy in the field, employed himself actively in strengthening his hold on the other cities, and in enlarging his military means at home. He sent a force against Messênê, to require the expulsion of the Syracusan exiles from that city, and to procure at the same time the recall of the Messenian exiles, partisans of his own, and companions of his army. His generals extorted these two points from the Messenians. Agathokles, having thus broken the force of Messênê, secured to himself the town still more completely, by sending for those Messenian citizens who had chiefly opposed him, and putting them all to death, as well as his leading opponents at Tauromenium.

[1] Diodor. xix. 71, 72, 102. When the convention specifies Herakleia, Selinus, and Himera, as being under the Carthaginians, this is to be understood as in addition to the primitive Carthaginian settlements of Solus, Panormus, Lilybæum, &c., about which no question could arise.

The number thus massacred was not less than six hundred[1].

It only remained for Agathokles to seize Agrigentum. Thither he accordingly marched. But Deinokratês and the Syracusan exiles, expelled from Messênê, had made themselves heard at Carthage, insisting on the perils to that city from the encroachments of Agathokles. The Carthaginians alarmed sent a fleet of sixty sail, whereby alone Agrigentum, already under siege by Agathokles, was preserved. The recent convention was now broken on all sides, and Agathokles kept no farther measures with the Carthaginians. He ravaged all their Sicilian territory, and destroyed some of their forts; while the Carthaginians on their side made a sudden descent with their fleet on the harbour of Syracuse. They could achieve nothing more, however, than the capture of one Athenian merchant-vessel, out of two there riding. They disgraced their acquisition by the cruel act (not uncommon in Carthaginian warfare) of cutting off the hands of the captive crew; for which, in a few days, retaliation was exercised upon the crews of some of their own ships, taken by the cruisers of Agathokles[2].

He is repulsed from Agrigentum—the Carthaginians send an armament to Sicily against him.

The defence of Agrigentum now rested principally on the Carthaginians in Sicily, who took up a position on the hill called Eknomus—in the territory of Gela, a little to the west of the Agrigentine border. Here Agathokles approached to

B.C. 310.

[1] Diodor. xix. 72: compare a different narrative—Polyænus, v. 15.

[2] Diodor. xix. 103. It must be noticed, however, that even Julius Cæsar, in his wars in Gaul, sometimes cut off the hands of his Gallic prisoners taken in arms, whom he called rebels (Bell. Gall. viii. 44).

Position of the Carthaginians between Gela and Agrigentum—their army reinforced from home.

offer them battle—having been emboldened by two important successes obtained over Deinokrates and the Syracusan exiles, near Kentoripa and Gallaria[1]. So superior was his force, however, that the Carthaginians thought it prudent to remain in their camp; and Agathokles returned in triumph to Syracuse, where he adorned the temples with his recently acquired spoils. The balance of force was soon altered by the despatch of a large armament from Carthage under Hamilkar, consisting of 130 ships of war, with numerous other transport ships, carrying many soldiers—2000 native Carthaginians, partly men of rank—10,000 Africans—1000 Campanian heavy-armed and 1000 Balearic slingers. The fleet underwent in its passage so terrific a storm, that many of the vessels sunk with all on board, and it arrived with very diminished numbers in Sicily. The loss fell upon the native Carthaginian soldiers with peculiar severity; insomuch that when the news reached Carthage, a public mourning was proclaimed, and the city walls were hung with black serge.

Operations of Agathokles against them—his massacre of citizens at Gela.

Those who reached Sicily, however, were quite sufficient to place Hamilkar in an imposing superiority of number as compared with Agathokles. He encamped on or near Eknomus, summoned all the reinforcements that his Sicilian allies could furnish, and collected additional mercenaries; so that he was soon at the head of 40,000 infantry and 5000 cavalry[2]. At the same time, a Carthaginian armed squadron, detached to the strait of Messênê, fell in with twenty armed ships belonging

[1] Diodor. xix. 103, 104.

[2] Diodor. xix. 106.

to Agathokles, and captured them all with their crews. The Sicilian cities were held to Agathokles principally by terror, and were likely to turn against him, if the Carthaginians exhibited sufficient strength to protect them. This the despot knew and dreaded; especially respecting Gela, which was not far from the Carthaginian camp. Had he announced himself openly as intending to place a garrison in Gela, he feared that the citizens might forestal him by calling in Hamilkar. Accordingly he detached thither, on various pretences, several small parties of soldiers, who presently found themselves united in a number sufficient to seize the town. Agathokles then marched into Gela with his main force. Distrusting the adherence of the citizens, he let loose his soldiers upon them, massacred four thousand persons, and compelled the remainder, as a condition of sparing their lives, to bring in to him all their money and valuables. Having by this atrocity both struck universal terror and enriched himself, he advanced onward towards the Carthaginian camp, and occupied a hill called Phalarion opposite to it[1]. The two camps were separated by a level plain or valley nearly five miles broad, through which ran the river Himera[2].

B.C. 310. Battle of the Himera, between Agathokles and the Carthaginians.

For some days of the hottest season (the dog-days), both armies remained stationary, neither of them choosing to make the attack. At length Agathokles gained what he thought a favourable opportunity. A detachment from the Carthaginian camp sallied forth in pursuit of some Grecian plunderers; Agathokles posted some men in am-

[1] Diodor. xix. 107, 108.

[2] Diodor. xix. 108, 109.

bush, who fell upon this detachment unawares, threw it into disorder, and pursued it back to the camp. Following up this partial success, Agathokles brought forward his whole force, crossed the river Himera, and began a general attack. This advance not being expected, the Grecian assailants seemed at first on the point of succeeding. They filled up a portion of the ditch, tore up the stockade, and were forcing their way into the camp. They were however repulsed by redoubled efforts, and new troops coming up, on the part of the defenders; mainly, too, by the very effective action of the 1000 Balearic slingers in Hamilkar's army, who hurled stones weighing a pound each, against which the Grecian armour was an inadequate defence. Still Agathokles, noway discouraged, caused the attack to be renewed on several points at once, and with apparent success, when a reinforcement landed from Carthage—the expectation of which may perhaps have induced Hamilkar to refrain from any general attack. These new troops joined in the battle, coming upon the rear of the Greeks; who were intimidated and disordered by such unforeseen assailants, while the Carthaginians in their front, animated to more energetic effort, first repulsed them from the camp, and then pressed them vigorously back. After holding their ground for some time against their double enemy, the Greeks at length fled in disorder back to their own camp, recrossing the river Himera. The interval was between four and five miles of nearly level ground, over which they were actively pursued and severely handled by the Carthaginian cavalry, 5000

Total defeat of Agathokles by the Carthaginians.

in number. Moreover, in crossing the river, many of them drank eagerly, from thirst, fatigue, and the heat of the weather; the saltness of the water proved so destructive to them, that numerous dead bodies are said to have been found unwounded on the banks[1]. At length they obtained shelter in their own camp, after a loss of 7000 men; while the loss of the victors is estimated at 500.

The Carthaginians recover a large part of Sicily from Agathokles. His depressed condition at Syracuse.

Agathokles, after this great disaster, did not attempt to maintain his camp, but set it on fire, and returned to Gela; which was well fortified and provisioned, capable of a long defence. Here he intended to maintain himself against Hamilkar, at least until the Syracusan harvest (probably already begun) should be completed. But Hamilkar, having ascertained the strength of Gela, thought it prudent to refrain from a siege, and employed himself in operations for the purpose of strengthening his party in Sicily. His great victory at the Himera had produced the strongest effect upon many of the Sicilian cities, who were held to Agathokles by no other bonds except those of fear. Hamilkar issued conciliatory proclamations, inviting them all to become his allies, and marching his troops towards the most convenient points. Presently Kamarina, Leontini, Katana, Taurominium, Messênê, Abakænum, with several other smaller towns and forts, sent to tender themselves as allies; and the conduct of Hamilkar towards all was so mild and equitable, as to give universal satisfaction. Agathokles appears to have been thus dispossessed of most part of the island, retaining

[1] Diodor. xix. 109.

little besides Gela and Syracuse. Even the harbour of Syracuse was watched by a Carthaginian fleet, placed to intercept foreign supplies. Returning to Syracuse after Hamilkar had renounced all attempts on Gela, Agathokles collected the corn from the neighbourhood, and put the fortifications in the best state of defence. He had every reason to feel assured that the Carthaginians, encouraged by their recent success, and reinforced by allies from the whole island, would soon press the siege of Syracuse with all their energy; while for himself, hated by all, there was no hope of extraneous support, and little hope of a successful defence[1].

He conceives the plan of attacking the Carthaginians in Africa.

In this apparently desperate situation, he conceived the idea of a novelty alike daring, ingenious, and effective; surrounded indeed with difficulties in the execution, but promising, if successfully executed, to change altogether the prospects of the war. He resolved to carry a force across from Syracuse to Africa, and attack the Carthaginians on their own soil. No Greek, so far as we know, had ever conceived the like scheme before; no one certainly had ever executed it. In the memory of man, the African territory of Carthage had never been visited by hostile foot. It was known that the Carthaginians would be not only unprepared to meet an attack at home, but unable even to imagine it as practicable. It was known that their territory was rich, and their African subjects harshly treated, discontented, and likely to seize the first opportunity for revolting. The landing of any hostile force near Carthage would strike such a blow, as at least to

[1] Diodor. xix. 110.

cause the recall of the Carthaginian armament in Sicily, and thus relieve Syracuse; perhaps the consequences of it might be yet greater.

His energy and sagacity in organizing this expedition. His renewed massacre and spoliation.

How to execute the scheme was the grand difficulty—for the Carthaginians were superior not merely on land, but also at sea. Agathokles had no chance except by keeping his purpose secret, and even unsuspected. He fitted out an armament, announced as about to sail forth from Syracuse on a secret expedition, against some unknown town on the Sicilian coast. He selected for this purpose his best troops, especially his horsemen, few of whom had been slain at the battle of the Himera: he could not transport horses, but he put the horsemen aboard with their saddles and bridles, entertaining full assurance that he could procure horses in Africa. In selecting soldiers for his expedition, he was careful to take one member from many different families, to serve as hostage for the fidelity of those left behind. He liberated, and enrolled among his soldiers, many of the strongest and most resolute slaves. To provide the requisite funds, his expedients were manifold; he borrowed from merchants, seized the money belonging to orphans, stripped the women of their precious ornaments, and even plundered the richest temples. By all these proceedings, the hatred as well as fear towards him was aggravated, especially among the more opulent families. Agathokles publicly proclaimed, that the siege of Syracuse, which the Carthaginians were now commencing, would be long and terrible—that he and his soldiers were accustomed to hardships and could endure them, but

that those, who felt themselves unequal to the effort, might retire with their properties while it was yet time. Many of the wealthier families—to a number stated as 1600 persons—profited by this permission; but as they were leaving the city, Agathokles set his mercenaries upon them, slew them all, and appropriated their possessions to himself[1]. By such tricks and enormities, he provided funds enough for an armament of sixty ships, well filled with soldiers. Not one of these soldiers knew where they were going; there was a general talk about the madness of Agathokles; nevertheless such was their confidence in his bravery and military resource, that they obeyed his orders without asking questions. To act as viceroy of Syracuse during his own absence, Agathokles named Antander his brother, aided by an Ætolian officer named Erymnon[2].

He gets out of the harbour, in spite of the blockading fleet. Eclipse of the sun. He reaches Africa safely.

The armament was equipped and ready, without any suspicion on the part of the Carthaginian fleet blockading the harbour. It happened one day that the approach of some corn-ships seduced this fleet into a pursuit; the mouth of the harbour being thus left unguarded, Agathokles took the opportunity of striking with his armament into the open sea. As soon as the Carthaginian fleet saw him sailing forth, they neglected the corn-ships, and prepared for battle, which they presumed that he was come to offer. To their surprise, he stood out to sea as fast as he could; they then pushed out in pursuit of him, but he had already got a considerable ad-

[1] Diodor. xx. 4, 5; Justin, xxii. 4. Compare Polyænus, v. 3-5.
[2] Diodor. xx. 4-16.

vance and strove to keep it. Towards nightfall however they neared him so much, that he was only saved by the darkness. During the night he made considerable way; but on the next day there occurred an eclipse of the sun so nearly total, that it became perfectly dark, and the stars were visible. The mariners were so terrified at this phenomenon, that all the artifice and ascendency of Agathokles were required to inspire them with new courage. At length, after six days and nights, they approached the coast of Africa. The Carthaginian ships had pursued them at a venture, in the direction towards Africa; and they appeared in sight, just as Agathokles was nearing the land. Strenuous efforts were employed by the mariners on both sides to touch land first; Agathokles secured that advantage, and was enabled to put himself into such a posture of defence that he repulsed the attack of the Carthaginian ships, and secured the disembarkation of his own soldiers, at a point called the Latomiæ or Stone quarries[1].

He burns his vessels —impressive ceremony for effecting this, under vow to Demeter.

After establishing his position ashore, and refreshing his soldiers, the first proceeding of Agathokles was to burn his vessels; a proceeding which seemed to carry an air of desperate boldness. Yet in truth the ships were now useless—for, if he was unsuccessful on land, they were not enough to enable him to return in the face of the Carthaginian fleet; they were even worse than useless, since, if he retained them, it was requisite that he should leave a portion of his army to guard them, and thus enfeeble his

[1] Diodor. xx. 6. Procopius, Bell. Vand. i. 15. It is here stated, that for nine days' march eastward from Carthage, as far as Juka, the land is παντελῶς ἀλίμενος.

means of action for the really important achievements on land. Convening his soldiers in assembly near the ships, he first offered a sacrifice to Demeter and Persephonê—the patron Goddesses of Sicily, and of Syracuse in particular. He then apprised his soldiers, that during the recent crossing and danger from the Carthaginian pursuers, he had addressed a vow to these Goddesses—engaging to make a burnt-offering of his ships in their honour, if they would preserve him safe across to Africa. The Goddesses had granted this boon; they had farther, by favourably responding to the sacrifice just offered, promised full success to his African projects; it became therefore incumbent on him to fulfil his vow with exactness. Torches being now brought, Agathokles took one in his hand, and mounted on the stern of the admiral's ship, directing each of the trierarchs to do the like on his own ship. All were set on fire simultaneously, amidst the sound of trumpets, and the mingled prayers and shouts of the soldiers[1].

Agathokles marches into the Carthaginian territory—captures Tunes—richness and cultivation of the country.

Though Agathokles had succeeded in animating his soldiers with a factitious excitement, for the accomplishment of this purpose, yet so soon as they saw the conflagration decided and irrevocable, thus cutting off all their communication with home—their spirits fell, and they began to despair of their prospects. Without allowing them time to dwell upon the novelty of the situation, Agathokles conducted them at once against the nearest Carthaginian town, called Megalê-Polis[2]. His march

[1] This striking scene is described by Diodorus, xx. 7 (compare Justin, xxii. 6), probably enough copied from Kallias, the companion and panegyrist of Agathokles: see Diodor. xxi. Fragm. p. 281.

[2] Megalê-Polis is nowhere else mentioned—nor is it noticed by

lay for the most part through a rich territory in the highest cultivation. The passing glance which we thus obtain into the condition of the territory near Carthage is of peculiar interest; more especially when contrasted with the desolation of the same coast, now and for centuries past. The corn-land, the plantations both of vines and olives, the extensive and well-stocked gardens, the size and equipment of the farm buildings, the large outlay for artificial irrigation, the agreeable country-houses belonging to wealthy Carthaginians, &c., all excited the astonishment, and stimulated the cupidity, of Agathokles and his soldiers. Moreover, the towns were not only very numerous, but all open and unfortified, except Carthage itself and a few others on the coast[1]. The Carthaginians, besides having little fear of invasion by sea, were disposed to mistrust their subject cities, which they ruled habitually with harshness and oppression[2]. The Liby-Pheni-

Forbiger in his list of towns in the Carthaginian territory (Handbuch der Alten Geographie, sect. 109).

Dr. Barth (Wanderungen auf den Küsten Ländern des Mittelmeeres, vol. i. p. 131–133) supposes that Agathokles landed at an indentation of the coast on the western face of that projecting tongue of land which terminates in Cape Bon (Promontorium Mercurii), forming the eastern boundary of the Gulf of Carthage. There are stone quarries here, of the greatest extent as well as antiquity. Dr. Barth places Megalê-Polis not far off from this spot, on the same western face of the projecting land, and near the spot afterwards called Misua.

A map, which I have placed in the Appendix, will convey to the reader some idea of the Carthaginian territory.

[1] Justin, xxii. 5. "Huc accedere, quod urbes castellaque Africæ non muris cinctæ, non in montibus positæ sint: sed in planis campis sine ullis munimentis jaceant: quas omnes metu excidii facile ad belli societatem perlici posse."

[2] Seven centuries and more after these events, we read that the Vandal king Genseric conquered Africa from the Romans—and that he

cians appear to have been unused to arms—a race of timid cultivators and traffickers, accustomed to subjection and practised in the deceit necessary for lightening it[1]. Agathokles, having marched through this land of abundance, assaulted Megalêpolis without delay. The inhabitants, unprepared for attack, distracted with surprise and terror, made little resistance. Agathokles easily took the town, abandoning both the persons of the inhabitants and all the rich property within, to his soldiers; who enriched themselves with a prodigious booty both from town and country—furniture, cattle, and slaves. From hence he advanced farther southward to the town called Tunês (the modern Tunis, at the distance of only fourteen miles south-west of Carthage itself), which he took by storm in like manner. He fortified Tunês as a permanent position;

demolished the fortifications of all the other towns except Carthage alone—from the like feeling of mistrust. This demolition materially facilitated the conquest of the Vandal kingdom by Belisarius, two generations afterwards (Procopius, Bell. Vandal. i. 5; i. 15).

[1] Livy (xxix. 25), in recounting the landing of Scipio in the Carthaginian territory in the latter years of the second Punic war, says, "Emporia ut peterent, gubernatoribus edixit. Fertilissimus ager, eoque abundans omnium copiâ rerum est regio, et imbelles (quod plerumque in uberi agro evenit) barbari sunt: priusque quam Carthagine subveniretur, opprimi videbantur posse."

About the harshness of the Carthaginian rule over their African subjects, see Diodor. xv. 77; Polyb. i. 72. In reference to the above passage of Polybius, however, we ought to keep in mind—That in describing this harshness, he speaks with *express and exclusive reference* to the conduct of the Carthaginians towards their subjects during the first Punic war (against Rome), when the Carthaginians themselves were hard pressed by the Romans and required everything that they could lay hands upon for self-defence. This passage of Polybius has been sometimes cited as if it attested the *ordinary* character and measure of Carthaginian dominion; which is contrary to the intention of the author.

but he kept his main force united in camp, knowing well that he should presently have an imposing army against him in the field, and severe battles to fight[1].

Consternation at Carthage—the city-force marches out against him—Hanno and Bomilkar named generals.

The Carthaginian fleet had pursued Agathokles during his crossing from Syracuse, in perfect ignorance of his plans. When he landed in Africa, on their own territory, and even burnt his fleet, they at first flattered themselves with the belief that they held him prisoner. But as soon as they saw him commence his march in military array against Megalêpolis, they divined his real purposes, and were filled with apprehension. Carrying off the brazen prow-ornaments of his burnt and abandoned ships, they made sail for Carthage, sending forward a swift vessel to communicate first what had occurred. Before this vessel arrived, however, the landing of Agathokles had been already made known at Carthage, where it excited the utmost surprise and consternation; since no one supposed that he could have accomplished such an adventure without having previously destroyed the Carthaginian army and fleet in Sicily. From this extreme dismay they were presently relieved by the arrival of the

[1] Diodor. xx. 8. Compare Polybius, i. 29, where he describes the first invasion of the Carthaginian territory by the Roman consul Regulus. Tunês was 120 stadia or about fourteen miles south-east of Carthage (Polyb. i. 67). The Tab. Peuting. reckons it only ten miles. It was made the central place for hostile operations against Carthage, both by Regulus in the first Punic war (Polyb. i. 30),—by Matho and Spendius, in the rebellion of the mercenary soldiers and native Africans against Carthage, which followed on the close of the first Punic war (Polyb. i. 73)—and by the revolted Libyans in 396 B.C. (Diodor. xiv. 77).

Diodorus places Tunês at the distance of 2000 stadia from Carthage, which must undoubtedly be a mistake. He calls it *White Tunês*; an epithet drawn from the chalk cliffs adjoining.

messengers from their fleet; whereby they learnt the real state of affairs in Sicily. They now made the best preparations in their power to resist Agathokles. Hanno and Bomilkar, two men of leading families, were named generals conjointly. They were bitter political rivals,—but this very rivalry was by some construed as an advantage, since each would serve as a check upon the other and as a guarantee to the state; or, what is more probable, each had a party sufficiently strong to prevent the separate election of the other[1]. These two generals, unable to wait for distant succours, led out the native forces of the city, stated at 40,000 infantry, 1000 cavalry, derived altogether from citizens and residents—with 2000 war-chariots. They took post on an eminence (somewhere between Tunis and Carthage) not far from Agathokles; Bomilkar commanding on the left, where the ground was so difficult that he was unable to extend his front, and was obliged to admit an unusual depth of files; while Hanno was on the right, having in his front rank the Sacred Band of Carthage, a corps of 2500 distinguished citizens, better armed and braver than the rest. So much did the Carthaginians outnumber the invaders—and so confident were they of victory—that they carried with them 20,000 pairs of handcuffs for their anticipated prisoners[2].

[1] Diodor. xx. 10.

[2] Diodor. xx. 10–13. See, respecting the Sacred Band of Carthage (which was nearly cut to pieces by Timoleon at the battle of the Krimesus), Diodor. xvi. 80, 81; also Vol. XI. of this History, Chap. lxxxv. p. 242–250.

The amount of native or citizen-force given here by Diodorus (40,000

Agathokles placed himself on the left, with 1000 chosen hoplites round him, to combat the Sacred Band; the command of his right he gave to his son Archagathus. His troops—Syracusans, miscellaneous mercenary Greeks, Campanians or Samnites, Tuscans, and Gauls—scarcely equalled in numbers one-half of the enemy. Some of the ships' crews were even without arms,—a deficiency, which Agathokles could supply only in appearance, by giving to them the leather cases or wrappers of shields, stretched out upon sticks. The outstretched wrappers thus exhibited looked from a distance like shields; so that these men, stationed in the rear, had the appearance of a reserve of hoplites. As the soldiers however were still discouraged, Agathokles tried to hearten them up by another device yet more singular, for which indeed he must have made deliberate provision beforehand. In various parts of the camp, he let fly a number of owls, which perched upon the shields and helmets of the soldiers. These birds, the favourite of Athênê, were supposed and generally asserted to promise victory; the minds of the soldiers are reported to have been much reassured by the sight.

Inferior numbers of Agathokles—his artifices to encourage the soldiers.

The Carthaginian war-chariots and cavalry, which charged first, made little or no impression; but the infantry of their right pressed the Greeks

Treachery of the Carthaginian general Bomilkar—victory of Agathokles.

foot and 1000 horse) seems very great. Our data for appreciating it however are lamentably scanty; and we ought to expect a large total. The population of Carthage is said to have been 700,000 souls; even when it was besieged by the Romans in the third Punic war, and when its power was prodigiously lessened (Strabo, xvii. p. 833). Its military magazines, even in that reduced condition, were enormous,—as they stood immediately previous to their being given up to the Romans, under the treacherous delusions held out by Rome.

seriously. Especially Hanno, with the Sacred Band around him, behaved with the utmost bravery and forwardness, and seemed to be gaining advantage, when he was unfortunately slain. His death not only discouraged his own troops, but became fatal to the army, by giving opportunity for treason to his colleague Bomilkar. This man had long secretly meditated the project of rendering himself despot of Carthage. As a means of attaining that end, he deliberately sought to bring reverses upon her; and no sooner had he heard of Hanno's death, than he gave orders for his own wing to retreat. The Sacred Band, though fighting with unshaken valour, were left unsupported, attacked in rear as well as front, and compelled to give way along with the rest. The whole Carthaginian army was defeated and driven back to Carthage. Their camp fell into the hands of Agathokles, who found among their baggage the very handcuffs which they had brought for fettering their expected captives[1].

Conquests of Agathokles among the Carthaginian dependencies on the eastern coast.

This victory made Agathokles for the time master of the open country. He transmitted the news to Sicily, by a boat of thirty oars, constructed expressly for the purpose—since he had no ships of his own remaining. Having fortified Tunês and established it as his central position, he commenced operations along the eastern coast (Zeugitana and Byzakium, as the northern and southern portions of it were afterwards denominated

[1] Diodor. xx. 12. The loss of the Carthaginians was differently given—some authors stated it at 1000 men—others at 6000. The loss in the army of Agathokles was stated at 200 men.

by the Romans) against the towns dependent on Carthage[1].

Religious terror and distress of the Carthaginians. Human sacrifice.

In that city, meanwhile, all was terror and despondency in consequence of the recent defeat. It was well known that the African subjects generally entertained nothing but fear and hatred towards the reigning city. Neither the native Libyans or Africans,—nor the mixed race called Liby-Phœnicians, who inhabited the towns[2]—could be depended on if their services were really needed. The distress of the Carthaginians took the form of religious fears and repentance. They looked back with remorse on the impiety of their past lives, and on their omissions of duty towards the Gods. To the Tyrian Herakles, they had been slack in transmitting the dues and presents required by their religion; a backwardness which they now endeavoured to make up by sending envoys to Tyre, with prayers and supplications, with rich presents, and especially with models in gold and silver of their sacred temples and shrines. Towards Kronus, or Moloch, they also felt that they had conducted themselves sinfully. The worship acceptable to that God required the sacrifice of young children, born of free and opulent parents, and even the choice child of the family. But it was now found out, on investigation, that many parents had recently put a fraud upon the God, by surreptitiously buying poor children, feeding them well, and then sacrificing them as their own. This discovery seemed at once to explain why Kronus had become offended, and what had brought upon them the recent defeat.

[1] Diodor. xx. 17.

[2] Diodor. xx. 55.

They made an emphatic atonement, by selecting 200 children from the most illustrious families in Carthage, and offering them up to Kronus at a great public sacrifice; besides which, 300 parents, finding themselves denounced for similar omissions in the past, displayed their repentance by voluntarily immolating their own children for the public safety. The statue of Kronus,—placed with outstretched hands to receive the victim tendered to him, with fire immediately underneath,—was fed on that solemnity certainly with 200, and probably with 500, living children[1]. By this monstrous

[1] Diodor. xx. 14. ἠτιῶντο δὲ καὶ τὸν Κρόνον αὐτοῖς ἐναντιοῦσθαι, καθόσον ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις θύοντες τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ τῶν υἱῶν τοὺς κρατίστους, ὕστερον ὠνούμενοι λάθρα παῖδας καὶ θρέψαντες ἔπεμπον ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν· καὶ ζητήσεως γενομένης, εὑρέθησάν τινες τῶν καθιερουργημένων ὑποβολιμαῖοι γεγονότες· τούτων δὲ λαβόντες ἔννοιαν, καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους πρὸς τοῖς τείχεσιν ὁρῶντες στρατοπεδεύοντας, ἐδεισιδαιμόνουν ὡς καταλελυκότες τὰς πατρίους τῶν θεῶν τιμάς· διορθώσασθαι δὲ τὰς ἀγνοίας σπεύδοντες, διακοσίους μὲν τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων παίδων προκρίναντες ἔθυσαν δημοσίᾳ· ἄλλοι δ' ἐν διαβολαῖς ὄντες, ἑκουσίως ἑαυτοὺς ἔδοσαν, οὐκ ἐλάττους ὄντες τριακοσίων· ἦν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀνδριὰς Κρόνου χαλκοῦς, ἐκτετακὼς τὰς χεῖρας ὑπτίας ἐγκεκλιμένας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὥστε τὸν ἐπιτεθέντα τῶν παίδων ἀποκυλίεσθαι καὶ πίπτειν εἴς τι χάσμα πλῆρες πυρός. Compare Festus ap. Lactantium, Inst. Div. i. 21; Justin, xviii. 6, 12.

In this remarkable passage (the more remarkable because so little information concerning Carthaginian antiquity has reached us), one clause is not perfectly clear, respecting the three hundred who are said to have voluntarily *given themselves up*. Diodorus means (I apprehend) as Eusebius understood it, that these were fathers who gave up *their children* (not themselves) to be sacrificed. The victims here mentioned as sacrificed to Kronus were children, not adults (compare Diodor. xiii. 86): nothing is here said about adult victims. Wesseling in his note adheres to the literal meaning of the words, dissenting from Eusebius: but I think that the literal meaning is less in harmony with the general tenor of the paragraph. Instances of self-devotion, by persons torn with remorse, are indeed mentioned: see the case of Imilkon, Diodor. xiv. 76; Justin, xix. 3.

We read in the Fragment of Ennius—"Pœni sunt soliti suos sacrificare puellos:" see the chapter iv. of Münter's work, Religion der Karthager, on this subject.

holocaust the full religious duty being discharged, and forgiveness obtained from the God, the mental distress of the Carthaginians was healed.

Operations of Agathokles on the eastern coast of Carthage—capture of Neapolis, Adrumetum, Thapsus, &c.

Having thus relieved their consciences on the score of religious obligation, the Carthaginians despatched envoys to Hamilkar in Sicily, acquainting him with the recent calamity, desiring him to send a reinforcement, and transmitting to him the brazen prow ornaments taken from the ships of Agathokles. They at the same time equipped a fresh army, with which they marched forth to attack Tunês. Agathokles had fortified that town, and established a strong camp before it; but he had withdrawn his main force to prosecute operations against the maritime towns on the eastern coast of the territory of Carthage. Among these towns, he first attacked Neapolis with success, granting to the inhabitants favourable terms. He then advanced farther southwards towards Adrumetum, of which he commenced the siege, with the assistance of a neighbouring Libyan prince named Elymas, who now joined him. While Agathokles was engaged in the siege of Adrumetum, the Carthaginians attacked his position at Tunês, drove his soldiers out of the fortified camp into the town, and began to batter the defences of the town itself. Apprised of this danger while besieging Adrumetum, but nevertheless reluctant to raise the siege,—Agathokles left his main army before it, stole away with only a few soldiers and some camp-followers, and conducting them to an elevated spot—half-way between Adrumetum and Tunês, yet visible from both—he caused them to kindle at night upon this eminence

a prodigious number of fires[1]. The effect of these fires, seen from Adrumetum on one side and from the army before Tunês on the other, was, to produce the utmost terror at both places. The Carthaginians besieging Tunês fancied that Agathokles with his whole army was coming to attack them, and forthwith abandoned the siege in disorder, leaving their engines behind. The defenders of Adrumetum, interpreting these fires as evidence of a large reinforcement on its way to join the besieging army, were so discouraged that they surrendered the town on capitulation[2].

[1] Diodor. xx. 17. *λάθρα προσῆλθεν ἐπί τινα τόπον ὀρεινὸν, ὅθεν ὁρᾶσθαι δυνατὸν ἦν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀδρυμητινῶν καὶ τῶν Καρχηδονίων τῶν Τύνητα πολιορκούντων· νυκτὸς δὲ συντάξας τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐπὶ πολὺν τόπον πυρὰ καίειν, δύξαν ἐποίησε, τοῖς μὲν Καρχηδονίοις, ὡς μετὰ μεγάλης δυνάμεως ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πορευόμενος, τοῖς δὲ πολιορκουμένοις, ὡς ἄλλης δυνάμεως ἀδρᾶς τοῖς πολεμίοις εἰς συμμαχίαν παραγεγενημένης.*

[2] Diodor. xx. 17. The incident here recounted by Diodorus is curious, but quite distinct and intelligible. He had good authorities before him in his history of Agathokles. If true, it affords an evidence for determining, within some limits, the site of the ancient Adrumetum, which Mannert and Shaw place at Herkla—while Forbiger and Dr. Barth put it near the site of the modern port called Susa, still more to the southward, and at a prodigious distance from Tunis. Other authors have placed it at Hamamat, more to the northward than Herkla, and nearer to Tunis.

Of these three sites, Hamamat is the only one which will consist with the narrative of Diodorus. Both the others are too distant. Hamamat is about forty-eight English miles from Tunis (see Barth, p. 184, with his note). This is as great a distance (if not too great) as can possibly be admitted; both Herkla and Susa are very much more distant, and therefore out of the question.

Nevertheless, the other evidence known to us tends apparently to place Adrumetum at Susa, and not at Hamamat (see Barth, p. 142–154; Forbiger, Handb. Geog. p. 845). It is therefore probable that the narrative of Diodorus is not true, or must apply to some other place on the coast (possibly Neapolis, the modern Nabel) taken by Agathokles, and not to Adrumetum.

He fortifies Aspis—undertakes operations against the interior country—defeats the Carthaginians again.

By this same stratagem—if the narrative can be trusted—Agathokles both relieved Tunês, and acquired possession of Adrumetum. Pushing his conquests yet farther south, he besieged and took Thapsus, with several other towns on the coast to a considerable distance southward[1]. He also occupied and fortified the important position called Aspis, on the south-east of the headland Cape Bon, and not far distant from it; a point convenient for maritime communication with Sicily[2].

By a series of such acquisitions, comprising in all not less than 200 dependencies of Carthage, Agathokles became master along the eastern coast[3].

[1] Diodor. xx. 17.

[2] Strabo, xvii. p. 834. Solinus (c. 30) talks of Aspis as founded by the *Siculi*. Aspis (called by the Romans Clypea), being on the eastern side of Cape Bon, was more convenient for communication with Sicily than either Carthage, or Tunis, or any part of the Gulf of Carthage, which was on the western side of Cape Bon. To get round that headland is, even at the present day, a difficult and uncertain enterprise for navigators: see the remarks of Dr. Barth, founded partly on his own personal experience (Wanderungen auf den Küstenlandern des Mittelmeeres, i. p. 196). A ship coming from Sicily to Aspis was not under the necessity of getting round the headland.

In the case of Agathokles, there was a further reason for establishing his maritime position at Aspis. The Carthaginian fleet was superior to him at sea; accordingly they could easily interrupt his maritime communication from Sicily with Tunis, or with any point in the Gulf of Carthage. But it was not so easy for them to watch the coast at Aspis; for in order to do this, they must get from the Gulf round Cape Bon.

[3] Diodor. xx. 17. The Roman consul Regulus, when he invaded Africa during the first Punic war, is said to have acquired, either by capture or voluntary adhesion, two hundred dependent cities of Carthage (Appian, Punica, c. 3). Respecting the prodigious number of towns in Northern Africa, see the very learned and instructive work of Mövers, Die Phönikier, vol. ii. p. 454 *seqq*. Even at the commencement of the third Punic war, when Carthage was so much reduced in power, she had still three hundred cities in Libya (Strabo, xvii. p. 833). It must be confessed that the name cities or towns (πόλεις) was used by some authors very vaguely. Thus Poseidonius ridiculed the affirmation of

He next endeavoured to subdue the towns in the interior, into which he advanced as far as several days' march. But he was recalled by intelligence from his soldiers at Tunês, that the Carthaginians had marched out again to attack them, and had already retaken some of his conquests. Returning suddenly by forced marches, he came upon them by surprise, and drove in their advanced parties with considerable loss; while he also gained an important victory over the Libyan prince Elymas, who had rejoined the Carthaginians, but was now defeated and slain[1]. The Carthaginians, however, though thus again humbled and discouraged, still maintained the field, strongly entrenched, between Carthage and Tunês.

Proceedings of Hamilkar before Syracuse—the city is near surrendering—he is disappointed, and marches away from it.

Meanwhile the affairs of Agathokles at Syracuse had taken a turn unexpectedly favourable. He had left that city blocked up partially by sea and with a victorious enemy encamped near it; so that supplies found admission with difficulty. In this condition, Hamilkar, commander of the Carthaginian army, received from Carthage the messengers announcing their recent defeat in Africa; yet also bringing the brazen prow ornaments taken from the ships of Agathokles. He ordered the envoys to conceal the real truth, and to spread abroad news that Agathokles had been destroyed with his armament; in proof of which he produced the prow ornaments,—an undoubted evidence that the ships had really

Polybius (Strabo, iii. p. 162), that Tiberius Gracchus had destroyed three hundred πόλεις of the Celtiberians; Strabo censures others who spoke of one thousand πόλεις of the Iberians. Such a number could only be made good by including large κῶμαι.

[1] Diodor. xx. 17, 18.

been destroyed. Sending envoys with these evidences into Syracuse, to be exhibited to Antander and the other authorities, Hamilkar demanded from them the surrender of the city, under promise of safety and favourable terms; at the same time marching his army close up to it, with the view of making an attack. Antander with others, believing the information and despairing of successful resistance, were disposed to comply; but Erymnon the Ætolian insisted on holding out until they had fuller certainty. This resolution Antander adopted. At the same time, mistrusting those citizens of Syracuse who were relatives or friends of the exiles without, he ordered them all to leave the city immediately, with their wives and families. No less than 8000 persons were expelled under this mandate. They were consigned to the mercy of Hamilkar, and his army without; who not only suffered them to pass, but treated them with kindness. Syracuse was now a scene of aggravated wretchedness and despondency; not less from this late calamitous expulsion, than from the grief of those who believed that their relatives in Africa had perished with Agathokles. Hamilkar had brought up his battering-engines, and was preparing to assault the town, when Nearchus, the messenger from Agathokles, arrived from Africa after a voyage of five days, having under favour of darkness escaped, though only just escaped, the blockading squadron. From him the Syracusan government learnt the real truth, and the victorious position of Agathokles. There was no farther talk of capitulation; Hamilkar—having tried a partial assault, which was vigorously re-

pulsed,—withdrew his army, and detached from it a reinforcement of 5000 men to the aid of his countrymen in Africa[1].

B.C. 309. Renewed attack of Hamilkar upon Syracuse—he tries to surprise Euryalus, but is totally defeated, made prisoner, and slain.

During some months, he seems to have employed himself in partial operations for extending the Carthaginian dominion throughout Sicily. But at length he concerted measures with the Syracusan exile Deinokrates, who was at the head of a numerous body of his exiled countrymen, for a renewed attack upon Syracuse. His fleet already blockaded the harbour, and he now with his army, stated as 120,000 men, destroyed the neighbouring lands, hoping to starve out the inhabitants. Approaching close to the walls of the city, he occupied the Olympieion, or temple of Zeus Olympius, near the river Anapus and the interior coast of the Great Harbour. From hence—probably under the conduct of Deinokrates and the other exiles, well-acquainted with the ground—he undertook by a night-march to ascend the circuitous and difficult mountain track, for the purpose of surprising the fort called Euryalus, at the highest point of Epipolæ, and the western apex of the Syracusan lines of fortification. This was the same enterprise, at the same hour, and with the same main purpose, as that of Demosthenes during the Athenian siege, after he had brought the second armament from Athens to the relief of Nikias[2]. Even Demosthenes, though conducting his march with greater precaution than Hamilkar, and successful in surprising the fort of Euryalus, had

[1] Diodor. xx. 15, 16.

[2] See Vol. VII. Ch. lx. p. 418 of this History; together with the second Plan of Syracuse, annexed to Vol. VII.

been driven down again with disastrous loss. Moreover, since his time, this fort Euryalus, instead of being left detached, had been embodied by the elder Dionysius as an integral portion of the fortifications of the city. It formed the apex of point of junction for the two converging walls—one skirting the northern cliff, the other the southern cliff, of Epipolæ[1]. The surprise intended by Hamilkar—difficult in the extreme, if at all practicable—seems to have been unskilfully conducted. It was attempted with a confused multitude, incapable of that steady order requisite for night-movements. His troops, losing their way in the darkness, straggled, and even mistook each other for enemies; while the Syracusan guards from Euryalus, alarmed by the noise, attacked them vigorously and put them to the rout. Their loss, in trying to escape down the steep declivity, was prodigious; and Hamilkar himself, making brave efforts to rally them, became prisoner to the Syracusans. What lent peculiar interest to this incident, in the eyes of a pious Greek, was that it served to illustrate and confirm the truth of prophecy. Hamilkar had been assured by a prophet that he would sup that night in Syracuse; and this assurance had in part emboldened him to the attack, since he naturally calculated on entering the city as a conqueror[2]. He did indeed take his evening

[1] For a description of the fortifications added to Syracuse by the elder Dionysius, see Vol. X. Ch. lxxxii. p. 658 of this History; also Plan IV. at the end of Vol. X.

[2] Diodor. xx. 29, 30. Cicero (Divinat. i. 24) notices this prophecy and its manner of fulfilment; but he gives a somewhat different version of the events preceding the capture of Hamilkar.

meal in Syracuse, literally fulfilling the augury. Immediately after it, he was handed over to the relatives of the slain, who first paraded him through the city in chains, then inflicted on him the worst tortures, and lastly killed him. His head was cut off and sent to Africa[1].

The Agrigentines stand forward as champions of Sicilian freedom against Agathokles and the Carthaginians.

The loss and humiliation sustained in this repulse —together with the death of Hamilkar, and the discord ensuing between the exiles under Deinokrates and the Carthaginian soldiers—completely broke up the besieging army. At the same time, the Agrigentines, profiting by the depression both of Carthaginians and exiles, stood forward publicly, proclaiming themselves as champions of the cause of autonomous city government throughout Sicily, under their own presidency, against both the Carthaginians on one side, and the despot Agathokles on the other. They chose for their general a citizen named Xenodokus, who set himself with vigour to the task of expelling everywhere the mercenary garrisons which held the cities in subjection. He began first with Gela, the city immediately adjoining Agrigentum, found a party of the citizens disposed to aid him, and in conjunction with them, overthrew the Agathoklean garrison. The Geloans, thus liberated, seconded cordially his efforts to extend the like benefits to others. The popular banner proclaimed by Agrigentum proved so welcome, that many cities eagerly invited her aid to shake off the

[1] Diodor. xx. 30. τὸν δ' οὖν Ἀμίλκαν οἱ τῶν ἀπολωλότων συγγενεῖς δεδεμένον ἀγαγόντες διὰ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ δειναῖς αἰκίαις κατ' αὐτοῦ χρησάμενοι, μετὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης ὕβρεως ἀνεῖλον.

yoke of the soldiery in their respective citadels, and regain their free governments[1]. Enna, Erbessus, Echetla[2], Leontini, and Kamarina, were all thus relieved from the dominion of Agathokles; while other cities were in like manner emancipated from the sway of the Carthaginians; and joined the Agrigentine confederacy. The Agathoklean government at Syracuse was not strong enough to resist such spirited manifestations. Syracuse still continued to be blocked up by the Carthaginian fleet; though the blockade was less efficacious, and supplies were now introduced more abundantly than before[3].

Mutiny in the army of Agathokles at Tunês—his great danger, and address in extricating himself.

The ascendency of Agathokles was thus rather on the wane in Sicily; but in Africa, he had become more powerful than ever—not without perilous hazards which brought him occasionally to the brink of ruin. On receiving from Syracuse the head of the captive Hamilkar, he rode forth close to the camp of the Carthaginians, and held it up to their view in triumph; they made respectful prostration before it, but the sight was astounding and mournful to them[4]. While they were thus in despondency, however, a strange vicissitude was on the point of putting their enemy into their hands. A violent mutiny broke out in the camp of Agathokles at Tunês, arising out of a drunken altercation between his son Archagathus and an Ætolian officer named

[1] Diodor. xx. 31. *διαβοηθείσης δὲ τῆς τῶν Ἀκραγαντίνων ἐπιβολῆς κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν νῆσον, ἐνέπεσεν ὁρμὴ ταῖς πόλεσι πρὸς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.*

[2] Enna is nearly in the centre of Sicily; Erbessus is not far to the north-east of Agrigentum; Echetla is placed by Polybius (i. 15) midway between the domain of Syracuse and that of Carthage.

[3] Diodor. xx. 32.

[4] Diodor. xx. 33. *οἱ δὲ Καρχηδόνιοι, περιαλγεῖς γενόμενοι, καὶ βαρβαρικῶς προσκυνήσαντες*, &c.

Lykiskus; which ended in the murder of the latter by the former. The comrades of Lykiskus rose in arms with fury to avenge him, calling for the head of Archagathus. They found sympathy with the whole army; who seized the opportunity of demanding their arrears of outstanding pay, chose new generals, and took regular possession of Tunês with its defensive works. The Carthaginians, informed of this outbreak, immediately sent envoys to treat with the mutineers, offering to them large presents and double pay in the service of Carthage. Their offer was at first so favourably entertained, that the envoys returned with confident hopes of success; when Agathokles, as a last resource, clothed himself in mean garb, and threw himself on the mercy of the soldiers. He addressed them in a pathetic appeal, imploring them not to desert him, and even drew his sword to kill himself before their faces. With such art did he manage this scene, that the feelings of the soldiers underwent a sudden and complete revolution. They not only became reconciled to him, but even greeted him with enthusiasm, calling on him to resume the dress and functions of general, and promising unabated obedience for the future[1]. Agathokles gladly obeyed

[1] Compare the description in Tacitus, Hist. ii. 29, of the mutiny in the Vitellian army commanded by Fabius Valens, at Ticinum.

"Postquam immissis lictoribus, Valens coercere seditionem cœptabat, ipsum invadunt (milites), saxa jaciunt, fugientem sequuntur.—Valens, servili veste, apud decurionem equitum tegebatur." (Presently the feeling changes, by the adroit management of Alphenus Varus, prefect of the camp)—then, "silentio, patientia, postremo precibus et lacyrmis, veniam quærebant. Ut vero deformis et flens, et præter spem incolumis Valens processit, gaudium, miseratio, favor: versi in lætitiam (ut est vulgus utroque immodicum) laudantes gratantesque circumdatum aquilis signisque, in tribunal ferunt."

the call, and took advantage of their renewed ardour to attack forthwith the Carthaginians; who, expecting nothing less, were defeated with considerable loss[1].

In spite of this check, the Carthaginians presently sent a considerable force into the interior, for the purpose of reconquering or regaining the disaffected Numidian tribes. They met with good success in this enterprise; but the Numidians were in the main faithless and indifferent to both the belligerents, seeking only to turn the war to their own profit. Agathokles, leaving his son in command at Tunês, followed the Carthaginians into the interior with a large portion of his army. The Carthaginian generals were cautious, and kept themselves in strong position. Nevertheless Agathokles felt confident enough to assail them in their camp; and after great effort, with severe loss on his own side, he gained an indecisive victory. This advantage however was countervailed by the fact, that during the action the Numidians assailed his camp, slew all the defenders, and carried off nearly all the slaves and baggage. The loss on the Carthaginian side fell most severely upon the Greek soldiers in their pay; most of them exiles under Klinon, and some Syracusan exiles. These men behaved with signal gallantry, and were nearly all slain, either during the battle or after the battle, by Agathokles[2].

B.C. 308–307. Carthaginian army sent to act in the interior—attacked by Agathokles with some success—his camp is pillaged by the Numidians.

It had now become manifest, however, to this daring invader, that the force of resistance possessed by Carthage was more than he could overcome—

Agathokles invites the aid of Ophellas from Kyrene.

[1] Diodor. xx. 34.

[2] Diodor. xx. 39.

that though humbling and impoverishing her for the moment, he could not bring the war to a triumphant close; since the city itself, occupying the isthmus of a peninsula from sea to sea, and surrounded with the strongest fortifications, could not be besieged except by means far superior to his[1]. We have already seen, that though he had gained victories and seized rich plunder, he had not been able to provide even regular pay for his soldiers, whose fidelity was consequently precarious. Nor could he expect reinforcements from Sicily; where his power was on the whole declining, though Syracuse itself was in less danger than before. He therefore resolved to invoke aid from Ophellas at Kyrênê, and despatched Orthon as envoy for that purpose[2].

Antecedent circumstances of Kyrênê. Division of coast between Kyrênê and Carthage.

To Kyrênê and what was afterwards called its Pentapolis (i.e. the five neighbouring Grecian towns, Kyrênê, its port Apollonia, Barka, Teucheira, and Hesperides), an earlier chapter of this history has already been devoted[3]. Unfortunately information respecting them, for a century and more anterior to Alexander the Great, is almost wholly wanting. Established among a Libyan population, many of whom were domiciliated with the Greeks as fellow-residents, these Kyreneans had imbibed many Libyan habits in war, in peace, and in religion; of which their fine breed of horses, employed both for the festival chariot-matches and in battle, was one

[1] Diodor. xx. 59. Ὁ δὲ τῆς πόλεως οὐκ ἦν κίνδυνος, ἀπροσίτου τῆς πόλεως οὔσης διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν καὶ τῆς θαλάττης ὀχυρότητα.

[2] Diodor. xx. 40.

[3] See Vol. IV. Ch. xxvii. p. 40–65.

example. The Libyan tribes, useful as neighbours, servants, and customers[1], were frequently also troublesome as enemies. In 413 B.C. we hear accidentally that Hesperides was besieged by Libyan tribes, and rescued by some Peloponnesian hoplites on their way to Syracuse during the Athenian siege[2]. About 401 B.C. (shortly after the close of the Peloponnesian war), the same city was again so hard pressed by the same enemies, that she threw open her citizenship to any Greek new-comer who would aid in repelling them. This invitation was accepted by several of the Messenians, just then expelled from Peloponnesus, and proscribed by the Spartans; they went to Africa; but, becoming involved in intestine warfare among the citizens of Kyrênê, a large proportion of them perished[3]. Except these scanty notices, we hear nothing about the Greco-Libyan Pentapolis in relation to Grecian affairs, before the time of Alexander. It would appear that the trade with the native African tribes, between the Gulfs called the Greater and Lesser Syrtis, was divided between Kyrênê (meaning the Kyrenaic Pentapolis) and Carthage—at a boundary point called the Altars of the Philæni, ennobled by a commemorative legend; immediately east of these Altars was Automala, the westernmost factory of Kyrênê[4]. We cannot doubt that the relations, commercial and otherwise, between Kyrênê and

[1] See Isokrates, Or. iv. (Philipp.) s. 6, where he speaks of Kyrênê as a spot judiciously chosen for colonization; the natives near it being not dangerous, but suited for obedient neighbours and slaves.

[2] Thucyd. vii. 50. [3] Pausan. iv. 26; Diodor. xiv. 34.

[4] Strabo, xvii. p. 836; Sallust, Bell. Jugurth. p. 126.

Carthage, the two great emporia on the coast of Africa, were constant and often lucrative—though not always friendly.

Thimbron with the Harpalian mercenaries is invited over to Kyrêne by exiles. His chequered career, on the whole victorious, in Libya.

In the year 331 B.C., when the victorious Alexander overran Egypt, the inhabitants of Kyrênê sent to tender presents and submission to him, and became enrolled among his subjects[1]. We hear nothing more about them until the last year of Alexander's life (324 B.C. to 323 B.C.). About that time, the exiles from Kyrênê and Barka, probably enough emboldened by the rescript of Alexander (proclaimed at the Olympic festival of 324 B.C., and directing that all Grecian exiles, except those guilty of sacrilege, should be recalled forthwith), determined to accomplish their return by force. To this end they invited from Krete an officer named Thimbron; who, having slain Harpalus after his flight from Athens (recounted in a previous chapter), had quartered himself in Krete, with the treasure, the ships, and the 6000 mercenaries, brought over from Asia by that satrap[2]. Thimbron willingly carried over his army to their assistance, intending to conquer for himself a principality in Libya. He landed near Kyrênê, defeated the Kyrenean forces with great slaughter, and made himself master of Apollonia, the fortified port of that city, distant from it nearly ten miles. The towns

[1] Arrian, vii. 9, 12; Curtius, iv. 7, 9; Diodor. xvii. 49. It is said that the inhabitants of Kyrênê (exact date unknown) applied to Plato to make laws for them, but that he declined. See Thrige, Histor. Cyrênês, p. 191. We should be glad to have this statement better avouched.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 108, xviii. 19; Arrian, De Rebus; post Alexandr. vi. apud Photium, Cod. 92; Strabo, xvii. p. 837.

of Barka and Hesperides sided with him; so that he was strong enough to force the Kyreneans to a disadvantageous treaty. They covenanted to pay 500 talents,—to surrender to him half of their war-chariots for his ulterior projects—and to leave him in possession of Apollonia. While he plundered the merchants in the harbour, he proclaimed his intention of subjugating the independent Libyan tribes, and probably of stretching his conquests to Carthage[1]. His schemes were however frustrated by one of his own officers, a Kretan named Mnasikles; who deserted to the Kyrenæans, and encouraged them to set aside the recent convention. Thimbron, after seizing such citizens of Kyrênê as happened to be at Apollonia, attacked Kyrênê itself, but was repulsed; and the Kyreneans were then bold enough to invade the territory of Barka and Hesperides. To aid them, Thimbron moved his quarters from Apollonia; but during his absence, Mnasikles contrived to surprise that valuable port; thus mastering at once his base of operations, the station for his fleet, and all the baggage of his soldiers. Thimbron's fleet could not be long maintained without a harbour. The seamen, landing here and there for victuals and water, were cut off by the native Libyans, while the vessels were dispersed by storms[2].

The Kyrenæans, now full of hope, encountered Thimbron in the field, and defeated him. Yet though reduced to distress, he contrived to obtain possession of Teucheira; to which port he invoked as auxiliaries 2500 fresh soldiers, out of the loose

[1] Diodor. xviii. 19.

[2] Diodor. xvii. 20.

mercenary bands dispersed near Cape Tænarus in Peloponnesus. This reinforcement again put him in a condition for battle. The Kyrenæans on their side also thought it necessary to obtain succour, partly from the neighbouring Libyans, partly from Carthage. They got together a force stated as 30,000 men, with which they met him in the field. But on this occasion they were totally routed, with the loss of all their generals and much of their army. Thimbron was now in the full tide of success; he pressed both Kyrênê and the harbour so vigorously, that famine began to prevail, and sedition broke out among the citizens. The oligarchical men, expelled by the more popular party, sought shelter, some in the camp of Thimbron, some at the court of Ptolemy in Egypt[1].

The Kyrenæans invite aid from the Egyptian Ptolemy, who sends Ophellas thither. Defeat and death of Thimbron. Kyrênaica annexed to the dominions of Ptolemy, under Ophellas as viceroy.

I have already mentioned, that in the partition after the decease of Alexander, Egypt had been assigned to Ptolemy. Seizing with eagerness the opportunity of annexing to it so valuable a possession as the Kyrenaic Pentapolis, this chief sent an adequate force under Ophellas to put down Thimbron and restore the exiles. His success was complete. All the cities in the Pentapolis were reduced; Thimbron, worsted and pursued as a fugitive, was seized in his flight by some Libyans, and brought prisoner to Teucheira; the citizens of which place (by permission of the Olynthian Epikydes, governor for Ptolemy), first tortured him, and then conveyed him to Apollonia to be hanged. A final visit from Ptolemy himself regulated the affairs of the Pentapolis, which were incorporated

[1] Diodor. xviii. 21.

with his dominions and placed under the government of Ophellas[1].

It was thus that the rich and flourishing Kyrênê, B.C. 322. an interesting portion of the once autonomous Hellenic world, passed like the rest under one of the Macedonian Diadochi. As the proof and guarantee of this new sovereignty, we find erected within the walls of the city, a strong and completely detached citadel, occupied by a Macedonian or Egyptian garrison (like Munychia at Athens), and forming the stronghold of the viceroy. Ten years afterwards (B.C. 312) the Kyrenæans made an attempt to emancipate themselves, and besieged this citadel; but being again put down by an army and fleet which Ptolemy despatched under Agis from Egypt[2], Kyrênê passed once more under the viceroyalty of Ophellas[3].

B.C. 308. Position and hopes of Ophellas. He accepts the invitation of Agathokles. He collects colonists from Athens and other Grecian cities.

To this viceroy Agathokles now sent envoys, invoking his aid against Carthage. Ophellas was an officer of consideration and experience. He had served under Alexander, and had married an Athenian wife, Euthydikê,—a lineal descendant from Miltiades the victor of Marathon, and belonging to a family still distinguished at Athens. In inviting Ophellas to undertake jointly the conquest of Carthage, the envoys proposed that he should himself hold it when conquered. Agathokles

[1] Arrian, De Rebus post Alex. vi. ap. Phot. Cod. 92; Diodor. xviii. 21; Justin, xiii. 6, 20.

[2] Diodor. xix. 79. Οἱ Κυρηναῖοι.....τὴν ἄκραν περιεστρατοπέδευσαν, ὡς αὔτικα μάλα τὴν φρουρὰν ἐκβαλοῦντες, &c.

[3] Justin (xxii. 7, 4) calls Ophellas "rex Cyrenarum;" but it is noway probable that he had become independent of Ptolemy—as Thrige (Hist. Cyrênês, p. 214) supposes. The expression in Plutarch (Demetrius, 14), Ὀφέλλᾳ τῷ ἄρξαντι Κυρήνης, does not necessarily imply an independent authority.

(they said) wished only to overthrow the Carthaginian dominion in Sicily, being well aware that he could not hold that island in conjunction with an African dominion. To Ophellas[1], such an invitation proved extremely seducing. He was already on the look out for aggrandisement towards the west, and had sent an exploring nautical expedition along the northern coast of Africa, even to some distance round and beyond the Strait of Gibraltar[2]. Moreover, to all military adventurers, both on sea and on land, the season was one of boundless speculative promise. They had before them not only the prodigious career of Alexander himself, but the successful encroachments of the great officers his successors. In the second distribution, made at Triparadeisus, of the Alexandrine empire, Antipater had assigned to Ptolemy not merely Egypt and Libya, but also an undefined amount of territory west of Libya, to be afterwards acquired[3]; the conquest of which was known to have been among the projects of Alex-

[1] Diodor. xx. 40.

[2] From an incidental allusion in Strabo (xvii. p. 826), we learn this fact—that Ophellas had surveyed the whole coast of Northern Africa, to the Straits of Gibraltar, and round the old Phenician settlements on the western coast of modern Morocco. Some eminent critics (Grosskurd among them) reject the reading in Strabo—*ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀφέλα* (or *Ὀφέλλα*) *περιπλοῦ*, which is sustained by a very great preponderance of MSS. But I do not feel the force of their reasons; and the reading which they would substitute has nothing to recommend it. In my judgment, Ophellas, ruling in the Kyrenaica and indulging aspirations towards conquest westward, was a man both likely to order, and competent to bring about, an examination of the North African coast. The knowledge of this fact may have induced Agathokles to apply to him.

[3] Arrian, De Rebus post Alex. 34, ap. Photium, Cod. 92. *Αἴγυπτον μὲν γὰρ καὶ Λιβύην, καὶ τὴν ἐπέκεινα τάυτης τὴν πολλὴν, καὶ ὅ,τι περ ἂν πρὸς τούτοις δόριον ἐπικτήσηται πρὸς δυομένου ἡλίου, Πτολεμαίου*

ander, had he lived longer. To this conquest Ophellas was now specially called, either as the viceroy or the independent equal of Ptolemy, by the invitation of Agathokles. Having learnt in the service of Alexander not to fear long marches, he embraced the proposition with eagerness. He undertook an expedition from Kyrênê on the largest scale. Through his wife's relatives, he was enabled to make known his projects at Athens, where, as well as in other parts of Greece, they found much favour. At this season, the Kassandrian oligarchies were paramount not only at Athens, but generally throughout Greece. Under the prevalent degradation and suffering, there was ample ground for discontent, and no liberty of expressing it; many persons therefore were found disposed either to accept army-service with Ophellas, or to enrol themselves in a foreign colony under his auspices. To set out under the military protection of this powerful chief—to colonize the mighty Carthage, supposed to be already enfeebled by the victories of Agathokles—to appropriate the wealth, the fertile landed possessions, and the maritime position, of her citizens—was a prize well calculated to seduce men dissatisfied with their homes, and not well informed of the intervening difficulties[1].

Under such hopes, many Grecian colonists joined

[1] Diodor. xx. 40. πολλοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων προθύμως ὑπήκουσαν εἰς τὴν στρατείαν· οὐκ ὀλιγοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων, ἔσπευδον κοινωνῆσαι τῆς ἐπιβολῆς, ἐλπίζοντες τήν τε κρατίστην τῆς Λιβύης κατακληρουχήσειν, καὶ τὸν ἐν Καρχηδόνι διαρπάσειν πλοῦτον.

As to the great encouragement held out to settlers, when a new colony was about to be founded by a powerful state, see Thucyd. iii. 93,

March of Ophellas, with his army, and his colonists, from Kyrênê to the Carthaginian territory—sufferings endured in the march.

Ophellas at Kyrênê, some even with wives and children. The total number is stated at 10,000. Ophellas conducted them forth at the head of a well-appointed army of 10,000 infantry, 600 cavalry, and 100 war-chariots; each chariot carrying the driver and two fighting men. Marching with this miscellaneous body of soldiers and colonists, he reached in eighteen days the post of Automolæ—the westernmost factory of Kyrênê[1]. From thence he proceeded westward along the shore between the two Syrtes, in many parts a sandy, trackless desert, without wood and almost without water (with the exception of particular points of fertility), and infested by serpents many and venomous. At one time, all his provisions were exhausted; he passed through the territory of the natives called Lotophagi, near the lesser Syrtis; where the army had nothing to eat except the fruit of the lotus, which there abounded[2]. Ophellas met with no enemies; but the sufferings of every kind endured by his soldiers—still more of course by the less hardy colonists and their families—were most distressing. After miseries endured for more than two months, he joined Agathokles in the Carthaginian territory; with what abatement of number, we do not know, but his loss must have been considerable[3].

B.C. 307. Ophellas little knew the man whose invitation

about Herakleia Trachinia—*πᾶς γάρ τίς, Λακεδαιμονίων οἰκιζόντων, θαρσαλέως ἥει, βεβαίαν νομίζων τὴν πόλιν.*

[1] Diodor. xx. 41.

[2] Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. iv. 3. p. 127, ed. Schneider.

The philosopher would hear this fact from some of the Athenians concerned in the expedition.

[3] Diodor. xx. 42. See the striking description of the miseries of this

and alliance he had accepted. Agathokles at first received him with the warmest protestations of attachment, welcoming the new-comers with profuse hospitality, and supplying to them full means of refreshment and renovation after their past sufferings. Having thus gained the confidence and favourable sympathies of all, he proceeded to turn it to his own purposes. Convening suddenly the most devoted among his own soldiers, he denounced Ophellas as guilty of plotting against his life. They listened to him with the same feelings of credulous rage as the Macedonian soldiers exhibited when Alexander denounced Philotas before them. Agathokles then at once called them to arms, set upon Ophellas unawares, and slew him with his more immediate defenders. Among the soldiers of Ophellas, this act excited horror and indignation, no less than surprise; but Agathokles at length succeeded in bringing them to terms, partly by deceitful pretexts, partly by intimidation: for this unfortunate army, left without any commander or fixed purpose, had no resource except to enter into his service[1]. He thus found himself (like Antipater after the death of Leonnatus) master

Perfidy of Agathokles —he kills Ophellas— gets possession of his army— ruin and dispersion of the colonists.

same march, made by Cato and his Roman troops after the death of Pompey, in Lucan, Pharsalia, ix. 382-940:—

"Vadimus in campos steriles, exustaque mundi,
Quà nimius Titan, et raræ in fontibus undæ,
Siccaque letiferis squalent serpentibus arva,
Durum iter."

The entire march of Ophellas must (I think) have lasted longer than two months; probably Diodorus speaks only of the more distressing or middle portion of it when he says—*κατὰ τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν πλεῖον ἢ δύο μῆνας κακοπαθήσαντες*, &c. (xx. 42).

[1] Diodor. xx. 42; Justin, xxii. 7.

of a double army, and relieved from a troublesome rival. The colonists of Ophellas—more unfortunate still, since they could be of no service to Agathokles—were put by him on board some merchant vessels, which he was sending to Syracuse with spoil. The weather becoming stormy, many of these vessels foundered at sea,—some were driven off and wrecked on the coast of Italy—and a few only reached Syracuse[1]. Thus miserably perished the Kyrenæan expedition of Ophellas; one of the most commanding and powerful schemes, for joint conquest and colonization, that ever set out from any Grecian city.

Terrible sedition at Carthage—Bomilkar tries to seize the supreme power—he is overthrown and slain.

It would have fared ill with Agathokles, had the Carthaginians been at hand, and ready to attack him in the confusion immediately succeeding the death of Ophellas. It would also have fared yet worse with Carthage, had Agathokles been in a position to attack her during the terrible sedition excited, nearly at the same time, within her walls by the general Bomilkar[2]. This traitor (as has been already stated) had long cherished the design to render himself despot, and had been watching for a favourable opportunity. Having purposely caused the loss of the first battle—fought in conjunction with his brave colleague Hanno, against Agathokles—he had since carried on the war with a view to his own project (which explains in part the continued reverses of the Carthaginians); he now thought that the time was come for openly raising his standard. Availing himself of a military muster in the quarter of the city called Neapolis,

[1] Diodor. xx. 44.

[2] Diodor. xx. 43.

he first dismissed the general body of the soldiers, retaining near him only a trusty band of 500 citizens, and 4000 mercenaries. At the head of these, he then fell upon the unsuspecting city; dividing them into five detachments, and slaughtering indiscriminately the unarmed citizens in the streets, as well as in the great market-place. At first the Carthaginians were astounded and paralysed. Gradually however they took courage, stood upon their defence against the assailants, combated them in the streets, and poured upon them missiles from the house-tops. After a prolonged conflict, the partisans of Bomilkar found themselves worsted, and were glad to avail themselves of the mediation of some elder citizens. They laid down their arms on promise of pardon. The promise was faithfully kept by the victors, except in regard to Bomilkar himself; who was hanged in the market-place, having first undergone severe tortures[1].

B.C. 307. Farther successes of Agathokles in Africa—he captures Utica, Hippo-Zarytus, and Hippagreta.

Though the Carthaginians had thus escaped from an extreme peril, yet the effects of so formidable a conspiracy weakened them for some time against their enemy without; while Agathokles on the other hand, reinforced by the army from Kyrênê, was stronger than ever. So elate did he feel, that he assumed the title of King[2]; following herein the example of the great Macedonian officers, Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleukus, Lysimachus, and

[1] Diodor. xx. 44; Justin, xxii. 7. Compare the description given by Appian (Punic. 128), of the desperate defence made by the Carthaginians in the last siege of the city, against the assault of the Romans, from these house-tops and in the streets.

[2] There are yet remaining coins—Ἀγαθοκλέος Βασιλέως—the earliest Sicilian coins that bear the name of a prince (Humphreys, Ancient Coins and Medals, p. 50).

Kassander; the memory of Alexander being now discarded, as his heirs had been already put to death. Agathokles, already master of nearly all the dependent towns east and south-east of Carthage, proceeded to carry his arms to the north-west of the city. He attacked Utica,—the second city next to Carthage in importance, and older indeed than Carthage itself—situated on the western or opposite shore of the Carthaginian Gulf, and visible from Carthage, though distant from it twenty-seven miles around the Gulf on land[1]. The Uticans had hitherto remained faithful to Carthage, in spite of her reverses, and of defection elsewhere[2]. Agathokles marched into their territory with such unexpected rapidity (he had hitherto been on the south-east of Carthage, and he now suddenly moved to the north-west of that city), that he seized the persons of three hundred leading citizens, who had not yet taken the precaution of retiring within the city. Having vainly tried to prevail on the Uticans to surrender, he assailed their walls, attaching in front of his batter-

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 832; Polyb. i. 73.

[2] Polybius (i. 82) expressly states that the inhabitants of Utica and of Hippu-Akra (a little farther to the west than Utica), remained faithful to Carthage throughout the hostilities carried on by Agathokles. This enables us to correct the passage wherein Diodorus describes the attack of Agathokles upon Utica (xx. 54)—*ἐπὶ μὲν Ἰτυκαίους ἐστράτευσεν ἀφεστηκότας, ἄφνω δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ πόλει προσπεσών*, &c. The word *ἀφεστηκότας* here is perplexing. It must mean that the Uticans had revolted *from Agathokles*; yet Diodorus has not before said a word about the Uticans, nor reported that they had either joined Agathokles, or been conquered by him. Everything that Diodorus has reported hitherto about Agathokles, relates to operations among the towns east or south-east of Carthage.

It appears to me that the passage ought to stand—*ἐπὶ μὲν Ἰτυκαίους ἐστράτευσεν οὐκ ἀφεστηκότας*, *i. e.* from Carthage; which introduces consistency into the narrative of Diodorus himself, while it brings him into harmony with Polybius.

ing engines the three hundred Utican prisoners; so that the citizens, in hurling missiles of defence, were constrained to inflict death on their own comrades and relatives. They nevertheless resisted the assault with unshaken resolution; but Agathokles found means to force an entrance through a weak part of the walls, and thus became master of the city. He made it a scene of indiscriminate slaughter, massacring the inhabitants, armed and unarmed, and hanging up the prisoners. He further captured the town of Hippu-Akra, about thirty miles north-west of Utica, which had also remained faithful to Carthage—and which now, after a brave defence, experienced the like pitiless treatment[1]. The Carthaginians, seemingly not yet recovered from their recent shock, did not interfere, even to rescue these two important places; so that Agathokles, firmly established in Tunês as a centre of operations, extended his African dominion more widely than ever all round Carthage, both on the coast and in the interior; while he interrupted the supplies of Carthage itself, and reduced the inhabitants to great privations[2]. He even occupied and fortified strongly a place called Hippagreta, between Utica and Carthage; thus pushing his posts within a short distance both east and west of her gates[3].

[1] Diodor. xx. 54, 55. In attacking Hippu-Akra (otherwise called Hippo-Zarytus, near the Promontorium Pulchrum, the northernmost point of Africa), Agathokles is said to have got the better in a naval battle—*ναυμαχίᾳ περιγενόμενος*. This implies that he must have got a fleet superior to the Carthaginians even in their own gulf; perhaps ships seized at Utica.

[2] Diodor. xx. 59.

[3] Appian distinctly mentions this place *Hippagreta* as having been fortified by Agathokles—and distinctly describes it as being between

B.C. 306–305. Agathokles goes to Sicily, leaving Archagathus to command in Africa. Successes of Archagathus in the interior country.

In this prosperous condition of his African affairs, he thought the opportunity favourable for retrieving his diminished ascendency in Sicily; to which island he accordingly crossed over, with 2000 men, leaving the command in Africa to his son Archagathus. That young man was at first successful, and seemed even in course of enlarging his father's conquests. His general Eumachus overran a wide range of interior Numidia, capturing Tokæ, Phellinê, Meschelæ, Akris, and another town bearing the same name of Hippu-Akra—and enriching his soldiers with a considerable plunder. But in a second expedition, endeavouring to carry his arms yet farther into the interior, he was worsted in an attack upon a town called Miltinê, and compelled to retreat. We read that he marched through one mountainous region abounding in wild cats—and another, in which there were a great number of apes, who lived in the most tame and familiar manner in the houses with men—being greatly caressed, and even worshiped as Gods[1].

B.C. 305. Redoubled efforts of the Carthaginians—they gain two great victories over Archagathus.

The Carthaginians however had now regained internal harmony and power of action. Their senate and their generals were emulous, both in vigour and in provident combinations, against the common enemy. They sent forth 30,000 men, a larger force than they had yet had in the field;

Utica and Carthage (Punic. 110). It cannot therefore be the same place as Hippu-Akra (or Hippo-Zarytus); which was considerably farther from Carthage than Utica was.

[1] Diodor. xx. 57, 58. It is vain to attempt to identify the places mentioned as visited and conquered by Eumachus. Our topographical knowledge is altogether insufficient. This second Hippu-Akra is supposed to be the same as Hippo-Regius; Tokæ may be Tucca Terebinthina, in the south-eastern region or Byzakium.

forming three distinct camps, under Hanno, Imilkon, and Adherbal, partly in the interior, partly on the coast. Archagathus, leaving a sufficient guard at Tunês, marched to meet them, distributing his army in three divisions also; two, under himself and Æschrion, besides the corps under Eumachus in the mountainous region. He was however unsuccessful at all points. Hanno, contriving to surprise the division of Æschrion, gained a complete victory, wherein Æschrion himself with more than 4000 men were slain. Imilkon was yet more fortunate in his operations against Eumachus, whom he entrapped by simulated flight into an ambuscade, and attacked at such advantage, that the Grecian army was routed and cut off from all retreat. A remnant of them defended themselves for some time on a neighbouring hill, but being without water, nearly all soon perished, from thirst, fatigue, and the sword of the conqueror[1].

B.C. 305. Danger of Archagathus—he is blocked up by the Carthaginians at Tunis.

By such reverses, destroying two-thirds of the Agathoklean army, Archagathus was placed in serious peril. He was obliged to concentrate his force in Tunês, calling in nearly all his outlying detachments. At the same time, those Liby-Phenician cities, and rural Libyan tribes, who had before joined Agathokles, now detached themselves from him when his power was evidently declining, and made their peace with Carthage. The victorious Carthaginian generals established fortified camps round Tunês, so as to restrain the excursions of Archagathus; while with their fleet they blocked up his harbour. Presently provisions became short,

[1] Diodor. xx. 59, 60.

and much despondency prevailed among the Grecian army. Archagathus transmitted this discouraging news to his father in Sicily, with urgent entreaties that he would come to the rescue[1].

B.C. 306–305. Agathokles in Sicily. His career at first prosperous. Defeat of the Agrigentines.

The career of Agathokles in Sicily, since his departure from Africa, had been chequered, and on the whole unproductive. Just before his arrival in the island[2], his generals Leptines and Demophilus had gained an important victory over the Agrigentine forces commanded by Xenodokus, who were disabled from keeping the field. This disaster was a fatal discouragement both to the Agrigentines, and to the cause which they had espoused as champions—free and autonomous city-government with equal confederacy for self-defence, under the presidency of Agrigentum[3]. The outlying cities confederate with Agrigentum were left without military protection, and exposed to the attacks of Leptines, animated and fortified by the recent arrival of his master Agathokles. That despot landed at Selinus—subdued Herakleia, Therma, and Kephaloidion, on or near the northern coast of Sicily—then crossed the interior of the island to Syracuse. In his march he assaulted Kentoripa, having some partisans within, but was repulsed with loss. At Apollonia[4], he was also unsuccessful in

[1] Diodor. xx. 61.

[2] Diodor. xx. 56. Ἀγαθοκλῆς δὲ, τῆς μάχης ἄρτι γεγενημένης, καταπλεύσας τῆς Σικελίας εἰς Σελινοῦντα, &c.

[3] Diodor. xx. 56. Οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἀκραγαντῖνοι ταύτῃ τῇ συμφορᾷ περιπεσόντες, διέλυσαν ἑαυτῶν μὲν τὴν καλλίστην ἐπιβολὴν, τῶν δὲ συμμάχων τὰς τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐλπίδας.

[4] Apollonia was a town in the interior of the island, somewhat to the north-east of Enna (Cicero, Verr. iii. 43).

his first attempt; but being stung with mortification, he resumed the assault next day, and at length, by great efforts, carried the town. To avenge his loss, which had been severe, he massacred most of the citizens, and abandoned the town to plunder[1].

From hence he proceeded to Syracuse, which he now revisited after an absence of (apparently) more than two years in Africa. During all this interval, the Syracusan harbour had been watched by a Carthaginian fleet, obstructing the entry of provisions, and causing partial scarcity[2]. But there was no blockading army on land; nor had the dominion of Agathokles, upheld as it was by his brother Antander and his mercenary force, been at all shaken. His arrival inspired his partisans and soldiers with new courage, while it spread terror throughout most parts of Sicily. To contend with the Carthaginian blockading squadron, he made efforts to procure maritime aid from the Tyrrhenian ports in Italy[3]; while on land, his forces were now preponderant—owing to the recent defeat, and broken spirit, of the Agrigentines. But his prospects were suddenly checked by the enterprising move of his old enemy—the Syracusan exile Deinokrates; who made profession of taking up that generous policy which the Agrigentines had tacitly let fall—announcing himself as the champion of autonomous city-government, and equal confederacy, throughout Sicily. Deinokrates received ready adhesion from most of the cities belonging to the Agrigentine confederacy—all of them who were alarmed by finding that the weakness or fears of their presiding city had

B.C. 306–305. Activity of Agathokles in Sicily—Deinokrates in great force against him.

[1] Diodor. xx. 56. [2] Diodor. xx. 62. [3] Diodor. xx. 61.

left them unprotected against Agathokles. He was soon at the head of a powerful army—20,000 foot, and 1500 horse. Moreover a large proportion of his army were not citizen militia, but practised soldiers; for the most part exiles, driven from their homes by the distractions and violences of the Agathoklean æra[1]. For military purposes, both he and his soldiers were far more strenuous and effective than the Agrigentines under Xenodokus had been. He not only kept the field against Agathokles, but several times offered him battle, which the despot did not feel confidence enough to accept. Agathokles could do no more than maintain himself in Syracuse, while the Sicilian cities generally were put in security against his aggressions.

Agrigentine army under Xenodokus —opposed to the mercenaries of Agathokles —superiority of the latter.

Amidst this unprosperous course of affairs in Sicily, Agathokles received messengers from his son, reporting the defeats in Africa. Preparing immediately to revisit that country, he was fortunate enough to obtain a reinforcement of Tyrrhenian ships of war, which enabled him to overcome the Carthaginian blockading squadron at the mouth of the Syracusan harbour. A clear passage to Africa was thus secured for himself, together with ample supplies of imported provisions for the Syracusans[2]. Though still unable to combat Deinokratęs in the field, Agathokles was emboldened by his recent naval victory to send forth Leptines with a force to invade the Agrigentines—the jealous rivals, rather than the allies, of Deinokrates. The

[1] Diodor. xx. 57. καὶ πάντων τούτων ἐν φυγαῖς καὶ μελέταις τοῦ πονεῖν συνεχῶς γεγονότων, &c.

[2] Diodor. xx. 61, 62.

Agrigentine army—under the general Xenodokus, whom Leptines had before defeated—consisted of citizen militia mustered on the occasion; while the Agathoklean mercenaries, conducted by Leptines, had made arms a profession, and were used to fighting as well as to hardships[1]. Here as elsewhere in Greece, we find the civic and patriotic energy trampled down by professional soldiership, and reduced to operate only as an obsequious instrument for administrative details.

Defeat of Xenodokus by Leptines—Agathokles passes over into Africa—bad state of his army there—he is defeated by the Carthaginians.

Xenodokus, conscious of the inferiority of his Agrigentine force, was reluctant to hazard a battle. Driven to this imprudence by the taunts of his soldiers, he was defeated a second time by Leptines, and became so apprehensive of the wrath of the Agrigentines, that he thought it expedient to retire to Gela. After a period of rejoicing, for his recent victories by land as well as by sea, Agathokles passed over to Africa, where he found his son, with the army at Tunês in great despondency and privation, and almost mutiny for want of pay. They still amounted to 6000 Grecian mercenaries, 6000 Gauls, Samnites, and Tyrrhenians—1500 cavalry—and no less than 6000 (if the number be correct) Libyan war-chariots. There were also a numerous body of Libyan allies; faithless time-servers, watching for the turn of fortune. The Carthaginians, occupying strong camps in the vicinity of Tunês, and abundantly supplied, awaited patiently the destroying effects of privation and suffering on their enemies. So desperate was the position of Agathokles, that he was compelled to go forth and

[1] Diodor. xx. 62.

fight. Having tried in vain to draw the Carthaginians down into the plain, he at length attacked them in the full strength of their entrenchments. But in spite of the most strenuous efforts, his troops were repulsed with great slaughter, and driven back to their camp[1].

Nocturnal panic and disorder in both camps.

The night succeeding this battle was a scene of disorder and panic in both camps; even in that of the victorious Carthaginians. The latter, according to the ordinances of their religion, eager to return their heartfelt thanks to the Gods for this great victory, sacrificed to them as a choice offering the handsomest prisoners captured[2]. During this process, the tent or tabernacle consecrated to the Gods, close to the altar as well as to the general's tent, accidentally took fire. The tents being formed by mere wooden posts, connected by a thatch of hay or straw both on roof and sides,—the fire spread rapidly, and the entire camp was burnt, together with many soldiers who tried to arrest the conflagration. So distracting was the terror occasioned by this catastrophe, that the whole Carthaginian army for the time dispersed; and Agathokles, had he been prepared, might have destroyed them. But it happened that at the same hour, his own camp was thrown into utter confusion by a different accident, rendering his soldiers incapable of being brought into action[3].

[1] Diodor. xx. 64; Justin, xxii. 8.

[2] Diodor. xx. 65. See an incident somewhat similar (Herod. vii. 180)—the Persians, in the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, sacrificed the handsomest Grecian prisoner whom they captured on board the first prize-ship that fell into their hands.

[3] Diodor. xx. 66, 67.

His position at Tunês had now become desperate. His Libyan allies had all declared against him, after the recent defeat. He could neither continue to hold Tunês, nor carry away his troops to Sicily; for he had but few vessels, and the Carthaginians were masters at sea. Seeing no resource, he resolved to embark secretly with his younger son Herakleides; abandoning Archagathus and the army to their fate. But Archagathus and the other officers, suspecting his purpose, were thoroughly resolved that the man who had brought them into destruction should not thus slip away and betray them. As Agathokles was on the point of going aboard at night, he found himself watched, arrested, and held prisoner, by the indignant soldiery. The whole town now became a scene of disorder and tumult, aggravated by the rumour that the enemy were marching up to attack them. Amidst the general alarm, the guards who had been set over Agathokles, thinking his services indispensable for defence, brought him out with his fetters still on. When the soldiers saw him in this condition, their sentiment towards him again reverted to pity and admiration, notwithstanding his projected desertion; moreover they hoped for his guidance to resist the impending attack. With one voice they called upon the guards to strike off his chains and set him free. Agathokles was again at liberty. But insensible to everything except his own personal safety, he presently stole away, leaped unperceived into a skiff, with a few attendants, but without either of his sons,—and was lucky enough to

B.C. 305.

Desperate condition of Agathokles —he deserts his army and escapes to Sicily.

arrive, in spite of stormy November weather, on the coast of Sicily[1].

The deserted army kill the two sons of Agathokles, and capitulate with the Carthaginians.

So terrible was the fury of the soldiers, on discovering that Agathokles had accomplished his desertion, that they slew both his sons, Archagathus and Herakleides. No resource was left but to elect new generals, and make the best terms they could with Carthage. They were still a formidable body, retaining in their hands various other towns besides Tunês; so that the Carthaginians, relieved from all fear of Agathokles, thought it prudent to grant an easy capitulation. It was agreed that all the towns should be restored to the Carthaginians, on payment of 300 talents; that such soldiers as chose to enter into the African service of Carthage, should be received on full pay; but that such as preferred returning to Sicily should be transported thither, with permission to reside in the Carthaginian town of Solus (or Soluntum). On these terms the convention was concluded, and the army finally broken up. Some indeed among the Grecian garrisons, quartered in the outlying posts, being rash enough to dissent and hold out, were besieged and taken by the Carthaginian force. Their commanders were crucified, and the soldiers condemned to rural work as fettered slaves[2].

Thus miserably terminated the expedition of Agathokles to Africa, after an interval of four years

[1] Diodor. xx. 69; Justin, xxii. 8. .....τὸ δὲ πλῆθος, ὡς εἶδεν, εἰς ἔλεον ἐτράπη, καὶ πάντες ἐπεβόων ἀφεῖναι· ὁ δὲ λυθεὶς καὶ μετ' ὀλίγων ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πορθμεῖον, ἔλαθεν ἐκπλεύσας κατὰ τὴν δύσιν τῆς Πληϊάδος, χειμῶνος ὄντος.

[2] Diodor. xx. 69.

African expedition of Agathokles—boldness of the first conception—imprudently pushed and persisted in.

from the time of his landing. By the *vana mirantes*[1], who looked out for curious coincidences (probably Timæus), it was remarked, that his ultimate flight, with the slaughter of his two sons, occurred exactly on the same day of the year following his assassination of Ophellas[2]. Ancient writers extol, with good reason, the bold and striking conception of transferring the war to Africa, at the very moment when he was himself besieged in Syracuse by a superior Carthaginian force. But while admitting the military resource, skill, and energy, of Agathokles, we must not forget that his success in Africa was materially furthered by the treasonable conduct of the Carthaginian general Bomilkar—an accidental coincidence in point of time. Nor is it to be overlooked, that Agathokles missed the opportunity of turning his first success to account, at a moment when the Carthaginians would probably have purchased his evacuation of Africa by making large concessions to him in Sicily[3]. He imprudently persisted in the war, though the complete conquest of Carthage was beyond his strength—and though it was still more beyond his strength to prosecute effective war, simultaneously and for a long time, in Sicily and in Africa. The

[1] Tacit. Annal. i. 9. "Multus hinc ipso de Augusto sermo, plerisque *vana mirantibus*—quod idem dies accepti quondam imperii princeps, et vitæ supremus—quod Nolæ in domo et cubiculo, in quo pater ejus Octavius, vitam finivisset," &c.

[2] Diodor. xx. 70.

[3] This is what Agathokles might have done, but did not do. Nevertheless, Valerius Maximus (vii. 4, 1) represents him as having actually done it, and praises his sagacity on that ground. Here is an example how little careful these collectors of anecdotes sometimes are about their facts.

African subjects of Carthage were not attached to her; but neither were they attached to him;—nor, on the long run, did they do him any serious good. Agathokles is a man of force and fraud—consummate in the use of both. His whole life is a series of successful adventures, and strokes of bold ingenuity to extricate himself from difficulties; but there is wanting in him all predetermined general plan, or measured range of ambition, to which these single exploits might be made subservient.

Proceedings of Agathokles in Sicily—his barbarities at Egesta and Syracuse.

After his passage from Africa, Agathokles landed on the western corner of Sicily near the town of Egesta, which was then in alliance with him. He sent to Syracuse for a reinforcement. But he was hard pressed for money; he suspected, or pretended to suspect, the Egestæans of disaffection; accordingly, on receiving his new force, he employed it to commit revolting massacre and plunder in Egesta. The town is reported to have contained 10,000 citizens. Of these Agathokles caused the poorer men to be for the most part murdered; the richer were cruelly tortured, and even their wives tortured and mutilated, to compel revelations of concealed wealth; the children of both sexes were transported to Italy, and there sold as slaves to the Bruttians. The original population being thus nearly extirpated, Agathokles changed the name of the town to Dikæopolis, assigning it as a residence to such deserters as might join him[1]. This atrocity, more

[1] Diodor. xx. 71. We do not know what happened afterwards with this town under its new population. But the old name Egesta was afterwards resumed.

suitable to Africa[1] than Greece (where the mutilation of women is almost unheard of), was probably the way in which his savage pride obtained some kind of retaliatory satisfaction for the recent calamity and humiliation in Africa. Under the like sentiment, he perpetrated another deed of blood at Syracuse. Having learnt that the soldiers, whom he had deserted at Tunês, had after his departure put to death his two sons, he gave orders to Antander his brother (viceroy of Syracuse), to massacre all the relatives of those Syracusans who had served him in the African expedition. This order was fulfilled by Antander (we are assured) accurately and to the letter. Neither age nor sex—grandsire or infant—wife or mother—were spared by the Agathoklean executioners. We may be sure that their properties were plundered at the same time; we hear of no mutilations[2].

Great mercenary force under Deinokrates in Sicily—Agathokles solicits peace from him, and is refused—he concludes peace with Carthage.

Still Agathokles tried to maintain his hold on the Sicilian towns which remained to him; but his cruelties as well as his reverses had produced a strong sentiment against him, and even his general Pasiphilus revolted to join Deinokrates. That exile was now at the head of an army stated at 20,000 men, the most formidable military force in Sicily; so that Agathokles, feeling the inadequacy of his own means, sent to solicit peace, and to offer

[1] Compare the proceedings of the Greco-Libyan princess Pheretimê (of the Battiad family) at Barka (Herodot. iv. 202).

[2] Diodor. xx. 72. Hippokrates and Epikydes—those Syracusans who, about a century afterwards, induced Hieronymus of Syracuse to prefer the Carthaginian alliance to the Roman—had resided at Carthage for some time, and served in the army of Hannibal, because their grandfather had been banished from Syracuse as one concerned in killing Archagathus (Polyb. vii. 2).

tempting conditions. He announced his readiness to evacuate Syracuse altogether, and to be content, if two maritime towns on the northern coast of the island—Therma and Kephaloidion—were assigned to his mercenaries and himself. Under this proposition, Deinokrates, and the other Syracusan exiles, had the opportunity of entering Syracuse, and reconstituting the free city-government. Had Deinokrates been another Timoleon, the city might now have acquired and enjoyed another temporary sunshine of autonomy and prosperity; but his ambition was thoroughly selfish. As commander of this large army, he enjoyed a station of power and licence such as he was not likely to obtain under the reconstituted city-government of Syracuse. He therefore evaded the propositions of Agathokles, requiring still larger concessions: until at length the Syracusan exiles in his own army (partly instigated by emissaries from Agathokles himself) began to suspect his selfish projects, and to waver in their fidelity to him. Meanwhile Agathokles, being repudiated by Deinokrates, addressed himself to the Carthaginians, and concluded a treaty with them, restoring or guaranteeing to them all the possessions that they had ever enjoyed in Sicily. In return for this concession, he received from them a sum of money, and a large supply of corn[1].

Battle of Torgium—victory of Agathokles over Deinokrates.

Relieved from Carthaginian hostility, Agathokles presently ventured to march against the army of Deinokrates. The latter was indeed greatly superior in strength, but many of his soldiers were now

[1] Diodor. xx. 78, 79. Some said that the sum of money paid by the Carthaginians was 300 talents. Timæus stated it at 150 talents.

lukewarm or disaffected, and Agathokles had established among them correspondences upon which he could rely. At a great battle fought near Torgium, many of them went over on the field to Agathokles, giving to him a complete victory. The army of Deinokrates was completely dispersed. Shortly afterwards a considerable body among them (4000 men, or 7000 men, according to different statements) surrendered to the victor on terms. As soon as they had delivered up their arms, Agathokles, regardless of his covenant, caused them to be surrounded by his own army, and massacred[1].

Accommodation and compact between Agathokles and Deinokrates.

It appears as if the recent victory had been the result of a secret and treacherous compact between Agathokles and Deinokrates; and as if the prisoners massacred by Agathokles were those of whom Deinokrates wished to rid himself as malcontents; for immediately after the battle, a reconciliation took place between the two. Agathokles admitted the other as a sort of partner in his despotism; while Deinokrates not only brought into the partnership all the military means and strong posts which he had been two years in acquiring, but also betrayed to Agathokles the revolted general Pasiphilus with the town of Gela occupied by the latter. It is noticed as singular, that Agathokles, generally faithless and unscrupulous towards both friends and enemies, kept up the best understanding and confidence with Deinokrates to the end of his life[2].

The despot had now regained full power at Syracuse, together with a great extent of dominion in Sicily. The remainder of his restless existence was B.C. 301.

[1] Diodor. xx. 89.

[2] Diodor. xx. 90.

Operations of Agathokles in Liparæ, Italy, and Korkyra—Kleonymus of Sparta.

spent in operations of hostility or plunder against more northerly enemies—the Liparæan isles[1]—the Italian cities and the Bruttians—the island of Korkyra. We are unable to follow his proceedings in detail. He was threatened with a formidable attack[2] by the Spartan prince Kleonymus, who was invited by the Tarentines to aid them against the Lucanians and Romans. But Kleonymus found enough to occupy him elsewhere, without visiting Sicily. He collected a considerable force on the coast of Italy, undertook operations with success against the Lucanians, and even captured the town of Thurii. But the Romans, now pushing their intervention even to the Tarentine Gulf, drove him off and retook the town; moreover his own behaviour was so tyrannical and profligate, as to draw upon him universal hatred. Returning from Italy to Korkyra, Kleonymus made himself master of that important island, intending to employ it as a base of operations both against Greece and against Italy[3]. He failed however in various expeditions both in the Tarentine

[1] Diodor. xx. 101. This expedition of Agathokles against the Liparæan isles seems to have been described in detail by his contemporary historian, the Syracusan Kallias: see the Fragments of that author, in Didot's Fragment. Hist. Græc. vol. ii. p. 383. Fragm. 4.

[2] Diodor. xx. 104.

[3] Diodor. xx. 104; Livy, x. 2. A curious anecdote appears in the Pseudo-Aristotle, De Mirabilibus (78), respecting two native Italians, Aulus and Caius, who tried to poison Kleonymus at Tarentum, but were detected and put to death by the Tarentines.

That Agathokles, in his operations on the coast of southern Italy, found himself in conflict with the Romans, and that their importance was now strongly felt—we may judge by the fact, that the Syracusan Kallias (contemporary and historian of Agathokles) appears to have given details respecting the origin and history of Rome. See the Fragments of Kallias, ap. Didot, Hist. Græc. Frag. vol. ii. p. 383; Fragm. 5—and Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. i. 72.

Gulf and the Adriatic. Demetrius Poliorketes and Kassander alike tried to conclude an alliance with him; but in vain[1]. At a subsequent period, Korkyra was besieged by Kassander with a large naval and military force; Kleonymus then retired (or perhaps had previously retired) to Sparta. Kassander, having reduced the island to great straits, was on the point of taking it, when it was relieved by Agathokles with a powerful armament. That despot was engaged in operations on the coast of Italy against the Bruttians when his aid to Korkyra was solicited; he destroyed most part of the Macedonian fleet, and then seized the island for himself[2]. On returning from this victorious expedition to the Italian coast, where he had left a detachment of his Ligurian and Tuscan mercenaries, he was informed that these mercenaries had been turbulent during his absence, in demanding the pay due to them from his grandson Archagathus. He caused them all to be slain, to the number of 2000[3].

B.C. 300–289. Last projects of Agathokles—mutiny of his grandson Archagathus—sickness, poisoning, and death of Agathokles.

As far as we can trace the events of the last years of Agathokles, we find him seizing the towns of Kroton and Hipponia in Italy, establishing an alliance with Demetrius Poliorketes[4], and giving his daughter Lanassa in marriage to the youthful Pyrrhus king of Epirus. At the age of seventy-two, still in the plenitude of vigour as well as of power, he was projecting a fresh expedition against the Carthaginians in Africa, with two hundred of the largest ships of war, when his career was brought to a close by sickness and by domestic enemies.

[1] Diodor. xx. 105.
[2] Diodor. xxi. Fragm. 2. p. 265.
[3] Diodor. xxi. Fragm. 3. p. 266.
[4] Diodor. xxi. Fragm. 4, 8, 11. p. 266-273.

He proclaimed as future successor to his dominion, his son, named Agathokles; but Archagathus his grandson (son of Archagathus who had perished in Africa), a young prince of more conspicuous qualities, had already been singled out for the most important command, and was now at the head of the army near Ætna. The old Agathokles, wishing to strengthen the hands of his intended successor, sent his favoured son Agathokles to Ætna, with written orders directing that Archagathus should yield up to him the command. Archagathus, noway disposed to obey, invited his uncle Agathokles to a banquet, and killed him; after which he contrived the poisoning of his grandfather the old despot himself. The instrument of his purpose was Mænon; a citizen of Egesta, enslaved at the time when Agathokles massacred most of the Egestean population. The beauty of his person procured him much favour with Agathokles; but he had never forgotten, and had always been anxious to avenge, the bloody outrage on his fellow-citizens. To accomplish this purpose, the opportunity was now opened to him, together with a promise of protection, through Archagathus. He accordingly poisoned Agathokles, as we are told, by means of a medicated quill, handed to him for cleaning his teeth after dinner[1]. Combining together the various accounts, it seems probable that Agathokles was at the time sick—

[1] Diodor. xxi. Fragm. 12. p. 276-278. Neither Justin (xxiii. 2) nor Trogus before him, (as it seems from the Prologue) alludes to poison. He represents Agathokles as having died by a violent distemper. He notices however the bloody family feud, and the murder of the uncle by the nephew.

that this sickness may have been the reason why he was so anxious to strengthen the position of his intended successor—and that his death was as much the effect of his malady as of the poison. Archagathus, after murdering his uncle, seems by means of his army to have made himself real master of the Syracusan power; while the old despot, defenceless on a sick bed, could do no more than provide for the safety of his Egyptian wife Theoxena and his two young children, by despatching them on shipboard with all his rich moveable treasures to Alexandria. Having secured this object, amidst extreme grief on the part of those around, he expired[1].

Splendid genius of action and resource—nefarious dispositions—of Agathokles.

The great lines in the character of Agathokles are well marked. He was of the stamp of Gelon and the elder Dionysius—a soldier of fortune, who raised himself from the meanest beginnings to the summit of political power—and who, in the acquisition as well as maintenance of that power, displayed an extent of energy, perseverance, and military resource, not surpassed by any one, even of the generals formed in Alexander's school. He was an adept in that art at which all aspiring men of his age aimed—the handling of mercenary soldiers for the extinction of political liberty and security at home, and for predatory aggrandisement abroad. I have already noticed the opinion delivered by Scipio Africanus—that the elder Dionysius

[1] Justin (xxiii. 2) dwells pathetically on this last parting between Agathokles and Theoxena. It is difficult to reconcile Justin's narrative with that of Diodorus; but on this point, as far as we can judge, I think him more credible than Diodorus.

and Agathokles were the most daring, sagacious, and capable men of action within his knowledge[1]. Apart from this enterprising genius, employed in the service of unmeasured personal ambition, we know nothing of Agathokles except his sanguinary, faithless, and nefarious dispositions; in which attributes also he stands pre-eminent, above all his known contemporaries, and above nearly all predecessors[2]. Notwithstanding his often-proved perfidy, he seems to have had a joviality and apparent simplicity of manner (the same is recounted of

[1] Polyb. xv. 35. See above in this History, Vol. XI. Ch. lxxxiii. p. 64.

[2] Polybius (ix. 23) says that Agathokles, though cruel in the extreme at the beginning of his career, and in the establishment of his power, yet became the mildest of men after his power was once established. The latter half of this statement is contradicted by all the particular facts which we know respecting Agathokles.

As to Timæus the historian, indeed (who had been banished from Sicily by Agathokles, and who wrote the history of the latter in five books), Polybius had good reason to censure him, as being unmeasured in his abuse of Agathokles. For Timæus not only recounted of Agathokles numerous acts of nefarious cruelty—acts of course essentially public, and therefore capable of being known—but also told much scandal about his private habits, and represented him (which is still more absurd) as a man vulgar and despicable in point of ability. See the Fragments of Timæus ap. Histor. Græc. ed. Didot, Frag. 144–150.

All, or nearly all, the acts of Agathokles, as described in the preceding pages, have been copied from Diodorus; who had as good authorities before him as Polybius possessed. Diodorus does not copy the history of Agathokles from Timæus; on the contrary, he censures Timæus for his exaggerated acrimony and injustice towards Agathokles, in terms not less forcible than those which Polybius employs (xxi. Fragm. p. 279). Diodorus cites Timæus by name, occasionally and in particular instances; but he evidently did not borrow from that author the main stream of his narrative. He seems to have had before him other authorities—among them some highly favourable to Agathokles—the Syracusan Kallias and Antander, brother of Agathokles (xxi. p. 278–282).

Cæsar Borgia) which amused men and put them off their guard, throwing them perpetually into his trap[1].

Agathokles, however, though among the worst of Greeks, was yet a Greek. During his government of thirty-two years, the course of events in Sicily continued under Hellenic agency, without the preponderant intervention of any foreign power. The power of Agathokles indeed rested mainly on foreign mercenaries; but so had that of Dionysius and Gelon before him; and he as well as they, kept up vigorously the old conflict against the Carthaginian power in the island. Grecian history in Sicily thus continues down to the death of Agathokles; but it continues no longer. After his death, Hellenic power and interests become incapable of self-support, and sink into a secondary and subservient position, overridden or contended for by foreigners. Syracuse and the other cities passed from one despot to another, and were torn with discord arising out of the crowds of foreign mercenaries who had obtained footing among them. At the same time, the Carthaginians made increased efforts to push their conquests in the island, without finding any sufficient internal resistance; so that they would have taken Syracuse, and made Sicily their own, had not Pyrrhus king of Epirus (the son-in-law of Agathokles) interposed to arrest their progress. From this time forward, the Greeks of Sicily become a prize to be contended for—first between the Carthaginians and Pyrrhus—next,

Hellenic agency in Sicily continues during the life of Agathokles, and becomes then subordinate to preponderant foreigners.

[1] Diodor. xx. 63.

between the Carthaginians and Romans[1]—until at length they dwindle into subjects of Rome; corn-growers for the Roman plebs, clients under the patronage of the Roman Marcelli, victims of the rapacity of Verres, and suppliants for the tutelary eloquence of Cicero. The historian of self-acting Hellas loses sight of them at the death of Agathokles.

[1] The poet Theokritus (xvi. 75–80) expatiates on the bravery of the Syracusan Hiero II., and on the great warlike power of the Syracusans under him (B.C. 260–240), which he represents as making the Carthaginians tremble for their possessions in Sicily. Personally, Hiero seems to have deserved this praise—and to have deserved yet more praise for his mild and prudent internal administration of Syracuse. But his military force was altogether secondary in the great struggle between Rome and Carthage for the mastery of Sicily.

CHAPTER XCVIII.

OUTLYING HELLENIC CITIES.

1. IN GAUL AND SPAIN.
2. ON THE COAST OF THE EUXINE.

To complete the picture of the Hellenic world while yet in its period of full life, in freedom and self-action, or even during its decline into the half-life of a dependent condition—we must say a few words respecting some of its members lying apart from the general history, yet of not inconsiderable importance. The Greeks of Massalia formed its western wing; the Pontic Greeks (those on the shores of the Euxine), its eastern; both of them the outermost radiations of Hellenism, where it was always militant against foreign elements, and often adulterated by them. It is indeed little that we have the means of saying; but that little must not be left unsaid.

Massalia—its situation and circumstances.

In my third volume (ch. xxii. p. 531), I briefly noticed the foundation and first proceedings of Massalia (the modern Marseilles), on the Mediterranean coast of Gaul or Liguria. This Ionic city, founded by the enterprising Phokæans of Asia Minor, a little before their own seaboard was subjugated by the Persians, had a life and career of its own, apart from those political events which determined the condition of its Hellenic sisters in Asia, Peloponnesus, Italy, or Sicily. The Mas-

saliots maintained their own relations of commerce, friendship or hostility with their barbaric neighbours, the Ligurians, Gauls, and Iberians, without becoming involved in the larger political confederacies of the Hellenic world. They carried out from their mother-city established habits of adventurous coast-navigation and commercial activity. Their situation, distant from other Greeks and sustained by a force hardly sufficient even for defence, imposed upon them the necessity both of political harmony at home, and of prudence and persuasive agency in their mode of dealing with neighbours. That they were found equal to this necessity, appears sufficiently attested by the few general statements transmitted in respect to them; though their history in its details is unknown. Their city was strong by position, situated upon a promontory washed on three sides by the sea, well-fortified, and possessing a convenient harbour securely closed against enemies[1]. The domain around it however appears not to have been large, nor did their population extend itself much into the interior. The land around was less adapted for corn than for the vine and the olive; wine was supplied by the Massaliots throughout Gaul[2]. It was on shipboard that their courage and skill was chiefly displayed; it was by maritime enterprise that their power, their wealth, and their colonial expansion was obtained. In an age when piracy was common, the Massaliot ships and seamen were effective in attack and defence not less than in

[1] Cæsar, Bell. Gall. ii. 1; Strabo, iv. p. 179.

[2] See Poseidonius ap. Athenæum, iv. p. 152.

transport and commercial interchange; while their numerous maritime successes were attested by many trophies adorning the temples[1]. The city contained docks and arsenals admirably provided with provisions, stores, arms, and all the various muniments of naval war[2]. Except the Phenicians and Carthaginians, these Massaliots were the only enterprising mariners in the Western Mediterranean; from the year 500 B.C. downward, after the energy of the Ionic Greeks had been crushed by inland potentates. The Iberian and Gallic tribes were essentially landsmen, not occupying permanent stations on the coast, nor having any vocation for the sea; but the Ligurians, though chiefly mountaineers, were annoying neighbours to Massalia as well by their piracies at sea as from their depredations by land[3]. To all these landsmen, however, depredators as they were, the visit of the trader soon made itself felt as a want, both for import and export; and to this want the Massaliots, with their colonies, were the only ministers, along the Gulfs of Genoa and Lyons, from Luna (the frontier of Tuscany) to the Dianium (Cape della Nao) in Spain[4]. It was not until the first century before the Christian era that they were outstripped in this

[1] Strabo, iv. p. 180.

[2] Strabo (xii. p. 575) places Massalia in the same rank as Kyzikus, Rhodes, and Carthage; types of maritime cities highly and effectively organized.

[3] Livy, xl. 18; Polybius, xxx. 4.

[4] The oration composed by Demosthenes *πρὸς Ζηνόθεμιν*, relates to an affair wherein a ship, captain, and mate, all from Massalia, are found engaged in the carrying trade between Athens and Syracuse (Demosth. p. 882 *seq.*).

career by Narbon, and a few other neighbours, exalted into Roman colonies.

Colonies planted by Massalia—Antipolis, Nikæa, Rhoda, Emporiæ—peculiar circumstances of Emporiæ.

Along the coast on both sides of their own city, the Massaliots planted colonies, each commended to the protection, and consecrated by the statue and peculiar rites, of their own patron Goddess, the Ephesian Artemis[1]. Towards the east were Tauroentium, Olbia, Antipolis, Nikæa, and the Portus Monœki; towards the west, on the coast of Spain, were Rhoda, Emporiæ, Alônê, Hemeroskopium, and Artemisium or Dianium. These colonies were established chiefly on outlying capes or sometimes islets, at once near and safe; they were intended more as shelter and accommodation for maritime traffic, and as depots for trade with the interior,—than for the purpose of spreading inland, and including a numerous outlying population round the walls. The circumstances of Emporiæ were the most remarkable. That town was built originally on a little uninhabited islet off the coast of Iberia; after a certain interval, it became extended to the adjoining mainland, and a body of native Iberians were admitted to joint residence within the new-walled circuit there established. This new circuit however was divided in half by an intervening wall, on one side of which dwelt the Iberians, on the other side the Greeks. One gate alone was permitted, for intercommunication, guarded night and day by appointed magistrates, one of whom was perpetually on the spot. Every night, one third of the Greek citizens kept

[1] Brückner, Histor. Massiliensium, c. 7 (Göttingen).

guard on the walls, or at least held themselves prepared to do so. How long these strict and fatiguing precautions were found necessary, we do not know; but after a certain time they were relaxed, and the intervening wall disappeared, so that Greeks and Iberians freely coalesced into one community[1]. It is not often that we are allowed to see so much in detail the early difficulties and dangers of a Grecian colony. Massalia itself was situated under nearly similar circumstances among the rude Ligurian Salyes; we hear of these Ligurians hiring themselves as labourers to dig on the fields of Massaliot proprietors[2]. The various tribes of Ligurians, Gauls, and Iberians extended down to the coast, so that there was no safe road along it, nor any communication except by sea, until the conquests of the Romans in the second and first century before the Christian era[3].

Oligarchical government of Massalia—prudent political administration.

The government of Massalia was oligarchical, carried on chiefly by a Senate or Great Council of Six Hundred (called Timuchi), elected for life—and by a small council of fifteen, chosen among this larger body to take turn in executive duties[4].

[1] Livy, xxxiv. 8; Strabo, iii. p. 160. At Massalia, it is said that no armed stranger was ever allowed to enter the city, without depositing his arms at the gate (Justin, xliii. 4).

This precaution seems to have been adopted in other cities also: see Æneas, Poliorket. c. 30.

[2] Strabo, iii. p. 165. A fact told to Poseidonius by a Massaliot proprietor who was his personal friend.

In the siege of Massalia by Cæsar, a detachment of Albici,—mountaineers not far from the town, and old allies or dependents—were brought in to help in the defence (Cæsar, Bell. G. i. 34).

[3] Strabo, iv. p. 180.

[4] Strabo, iv. p. 181; Cicero, De Republ. xxvii. Fragm. Vacancies in the senate seem to have been filled up from meritorious citizens generally—as far as we can judge by a brief allusion in Aristotle (Polit. vi. 7).

The public habits of the administrators are said to have been extremely vigilant and circumspect; the private habits of the citizens, frugal and temperate —a maximum being fixed by law for dowries and marriage-ceremonies[1]. They were careful in their dealings with the native tribes, with whom they appear to have maintained relations generally friendly. The historian Ephorus (whose history closed about 340 B.C.) represented the Gauls as especially phil-hellenic[2]; an impression which he could hardly have derived from any but Massaliot informants. The Massaliots (who in the first century before Christ were *trilingues*, speaking Greek, Latin, and Gallic[3]) contributed to engraft upon these unlettered men a certain refinement and variety of wants, and to lay the foundation of that taste for letters which afterwards became largely diffused throughout the Roman Province of Gaul. At sea, and in traffic, the Phenicians and Carthaginians were their formidable rivals. This was

From another passage in the same work, it seems that the narrow basis of the oligarchy must have given rise to dissensions (v. 6). Aristotle had included the Μασσαλιωτῶν πολιτεία in his lost work Περὶ Πολιτειῶν.

[1] Strabo, *l. c.* However, one author from whom Athenæus borrowed (xii. p. 523), described the Massaliots as luxurious in their habits.

[2] Strabo, iv. p. 199. Ἔφορος δὲ ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῷ μεγέθει λέγει τὴν Κελτικήν, ὥστε ἥσπερ νῦν Ἰβηρίας καλοῦμεν ἐκείνοις τὰ πλεῖστα προσνέμειν μέχρι Γαδείρων, φιλέλληνάς τε ἀποφαίνει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ πολλὰ ἰδίως λέγει περὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐοικότα τοῖς νῦν. Compare p. 181.

It is to be remembered that Ephorus was a native of the Asiatic Kymê, the immediate neighbour of Phokæa, which was the metropolis of Massalia. The Massaliots never forgot or broke off their connexion with Phokæa: see the statement of their intercession with the Romans on behalf of Phokæa (Justin, xxxvii. 1). Ephorus therefore had good means of learning whatever Massaliot citizens were disposed to communicate.

[3] Varro, Antiq. Fragm. p. 350, ed. Bipont.

among the causes which threw them betimes into alliance and active cooperation with Rome, under whose rule they obtained favourable treatment, when the blessing of freedom was no longer within their reach.

Hellenising influence of Massalia in the West—Pytheas, the navigator and geographer.

Enough is known about Massalia to show that the city was a genuine specimen of Hellenism and Hellenic influences—acting not by force or constraint, but simply by superior intelligence and activity—by power of ministering to wants which must otherwise have remained unsupplied—and by the assimilating effect of a lettered civilization upon ruder neighbours. This is the more to be noticed as it contrasts strikingly with the Macedonian influences which have occupied so much of the present volume; force admirably organized and wielded by Alexander, yet still nothing but force. The loss of all details respecting the history of Massalia is greatly to be lamented; and hardly less, that of the writings of Pytheas, an intelligent Massaliotic navigator, who, at this early age (330–320 B.C.)[1],

[1] See the Fragmenta Pytheæ collected by Arfwedson, Upsal, 1824. He wrote two works—1. Γῆς Περιόδος. 2. Περὶ Ὠκεανοῦ. His statements were greatly esteemed, and often followed, by Eratosthenes; partially followed by Hipparchus; harshly judged by Polybius, whom Strabo in the main follows. Even by those who judge him most severely, Pytheas is admitted to have been a good mathematician and astronomer (Strabo, iv. p. 201)—and to have travelled extensively in person. Like Herodotus, he must have been forced to report a great deal on hearsay; and all that he could do was to report the best hearsay information which reached him. It is evident that his writings made an epoch in geographical inquiries; though they doubtless contained numerous inaccuracies. See a fair estimate of Pytheas in Mannert, Geog. der Gr. und Römer, Introd. i. p. 73–86.

The Massaliotic Codex of Homer, possessed and consulted among others by the Alexandrine critics, affords presumption that the celebrity of Massalia as a place of Grecian literature and study (in which charac-

with calumnies of his own, and suborned other accusers with false testimony. Whatever may be the truth of the story, Alexander caused Orsines to be hanged; naming as satrap Peukestes, whose favour was now high, partly as comrade and preserver of the king in his imminent danger at the citadel of the Malli,—partly from his having adopted the Persian dress, manners, and language, more completely than any other Macedonian [1].

B.C. 324, early spring.

He marches to Susa—junction with the fleet under Nearchus, after it had sailed round from the mouth of the Indus.

It was about February, in 324 B.C.[2], that Alexander marched out of Persis to Susa. During this progress, at the point where he crossed the Pasitigris, he was again joined by Nearchus, who having completed his circumnavigation from the mouth of the Indus to that of the Euphrates, had sailed back with the fleet from the latter river and come up the Pasitigris[3]. It is probable that the division of He-

[1] Arrian, vi. 30; Curtius, x. 1, 22-30.

[2] Mr. Fynes Clinton (Fast. Hellen. B.C. 325, also Append. p. 232) places the arrival of Alexander in Susiana, on his return march, in the month of February B.C. 325; a year too early, in my opinion. I have before remarked on the views of Mr. Clinton respecting the date of Alexander's victory over Porus on the Hydaspes, where he alters the name of the month as it stands in the text of Arrian (following Schmieder's conjecture), and supposes that battle to have occurred in August B.C. 327 instead of April B.C. 326. Mr. Clinton antedates by one year all the proceedings of Alexander subsequent to his quitting Baktria for the last time in the summer of B.C. 327. Dr. Vincent's remark—"that the supposition of *two winters* occurring after Alexander's return to Susa is not borne out by the historians" (see Clinton, p. 232), is a perfectly just one; and Mitford has not replied to it in a satisfactory manner. In my judgement, there was only an interval of sixteen months (not an interval of twenty-eight months, as Mr. Clinton supposes) between the return of Alexander to Susa and his death at Babylon (Feb. 324 B.C. to June 323 B.C.).

[3] Arrian, vii. 5, 9; Arrian, Indica, c. 42. The voluntary death of Kalanus the Indian Gymnosophist must have taken place at Susa (where Diodorus places it—xvii. 107), and not in Persis; for Nearchus was

phæstion also rejoined him at Susa, and that the whole army was there for the first time brought together, after the separation in Karmania.

B.C. 324, spring and summer.

Alexander at Susa as Great King. Subjects of uneasiness to him—the satraps—the Macedonian soldiers.

In Susa and Susiana Alexander spent some months. For the first time since his accession to the throne, he had now no military operations in hand or in immediate prospect. No enemy was before him, until it pleased him to go in quest of a new one;—nor indeed could any new one be found, except at a prodigious distance. He had emerged from the perils of the untrodden East, and had returned into the ordinary localities and conditions of Persian rule, occupying that capital city from whence the great Achæmenid kings had been accustomed to govern the Western as well as the Eastern portions of their vast empire. To their post, and to their irritable love of servility, Alexander had succeeded; but bringing with him a restless energy such as none of them except the first founder Cyrus had manifested—and a splendid military genius, such as was unknown alike to Cyrus and to his successors.

Past conduct of the satraps—several of them are punished by Alexander—alarm among them all—flight of Harpalus.

In the new position of Alexander, his principal subjects of uneasiness were, the satraps and the Macedonian soldiers. During the long interval (more than five years) which had elapsed since he marched eastward from Hyrkania in pursuit of Bessus, the satraps had necessarily been left much to themselves. Some had imagined that he would never return; an anticipation noway unreasonable, since his own impulse towards forward march was

seemingly present at the memorable scene of the funeral pile (Arrian, vii. 3, 9)—and he was not with Alexander in Persis.

the subjects of Persia; and it is a remarkable fact, that envoys from Sinôpê were found remaining with Darius almost to his last hour, after he had become a conquered fugitive, and had lost his armies, his capitals, and his treasures. These Sinopian envoys fell into the hands of Alexander; who set them at liberty with the remark, that since they were not members of the Hellenic confederacy, but subjects of Persia—their presence as envoys near Darius was very excusable[1]. The position of Sinôpê placed her out of the direct range of the hostilities carried on by Alexander's successors against each other; and the ancient Kappadokian princes of the Mithridatic family (professedly descendants of the Persian Achæmenidæ)[2], who ultimately ripened into the king of Pontus, had not become sufficiently powerful to swallow up her independence until the reign of Pharnakes, in the second century before Christ. Sinôpê then passed under his dominion; exchanging (like others) the condition of a free Grecian city for that of a subject of the barbaric kings of Pontus, with a citadel and mercenary garrison to keep her citizens in obedience. We know nothing however of the intermediate events.

The Pontic Herakleia—oligarchical government—the native Mariandyni reduced to serfs.

Respecting the Pontic Herakleia, our ignorance is not so complete. That city—much nearer than Sinôpê to the mouth of the Thracian Bosporus, and distant by sea from Byzantium only one long day's voyage of a rowboat—was established by Megarians and Bœotians on the coast of the Mariandyni. These natives were subdued, and reduced to a kind of serfdom; whereby they became slaves,

[1] Arrian, iii. 24, 8; Curtius, vi. 5, 6.

[2] Polybius, v. 43.

yet with a proviso that they should never be sold out of the territory. Adjoining, on the westward, between Herakleia and Byzantium, were the Bithynian Thracians—villagers not merely independent, but warlike and fierce wreckers, who cruelly maltreated any Greeks stranded on their coast[1]. We are told in general terms that the government of Herakleia was oligarchical[2]; perhaps in the hands of the descendants of the principal original colonists, who partitioned among themselves the territory with its Mariandynian serfs, and who formed a small but rich minority among the total population. We hear of them as powerful at sea, and as being able to man, through their numerous serfs, a considerable fleet, with which they invaded the territory of Leukon prince of the Kimmerian Bosporus[3]. They were also engaged in land-war with Mithridates, a prince of the ancient Persian family established as district rulers in Northern Kappadokia[4].

Towards 380–370 B.C. the Herakleots became disturbed by violent party-contentions within the

[1] Xenoph. Anab. vi. 6, 2.

[2] Aristot. Polit. v. 5, 2; v. 5, 5. Another passage in the same work, however (v. 4, 2), says, that in Herakleia, the democracy was subverted immediately after the foundation of the colony, through the popular leaders; who committed injustice against the rich. These rich men were banished, but collected strength enough to return and subvert the democracy by force. If this passage alludes to the same Herakleia (there were many towns of that name), the government must have been originally democratical. But the serfdom of the natives seems to imply an oligarchy.

[3] Aristot. Polit. vii. 5, 7; Polyæn. vi. 9, 3, 4: compare Pseudo-Aristotle, Œconomic. ii. 9.

The reign of Leukon lasted from about 392–352 B.C. The event alluded to by Polyænus must have occurred at some time during this interval.

[4] Justin, xvi. 4.

Political discord at Herakleia —banishment of Klearchus —partial democracy established.

city. As far as we can divine from a few obscure hints, these contentions began among the oligarchy themselves[1]; some of whom opposed, and partially threw open, a close political monopoly—yet not without a struggle, in the course of which an energetic citizen named Klearchus was banished. Presently however the contest assumed larger dimensions; the plebs sought admission into the constitution, and are even said to have required abolition of debts with a redivision of the lands[2]. A democratical constitution was established; but it was speedily menaced by conspiracies of the rich, to guard against which, the classification of the citizens was altered. Instead of three tribes, and four centuries, all were distributed anew into sixty-four centuries; the tribes being discontinued. It would appear that in the original four centuries, the rich men had been so enrolled as to form separate military divisions (probably their rustic serfs being armed along with them)—while the three tribes had contained all the rest of the people; so that the effect of thus multiplying the centuries was, to divest the rich of their separate military enrolment, and to disseminate them in many different regiments along with a greater number of poor[3].

B.C. 364. Still however the demands of the people were not

[1] Aristot. v. 5, 2; 5, 10.

[2] Justin, xvi. 4.

[3] Æneas, Poliorket. c. 11. I have given what seems the most probable explanation of a very obscure passage.

It is to be noted that the distribution of citizens into centuries (ἑκατοστύες) prevailed also at Byzantium; see Inscript. No. 2060 ap. Boeck. Corp. Inscr. Græc. p. 130. A citizen of Olbia, upon whom the citizenship of Byzantium is conferred, is allowed to enroll himself in any one of the ἑκατοστύες that he prefers.

fully granted, and dissension continued. Not merely the poorer citizens, but also the population of serfs —homogeneous, speaking the same language, and sympathising with each other, like Helots or Penestæ—when once agitated by the hope of liberty, were with difficulty appeased. The government, though greatly democratised, found itself unable to maintain tranquillity, and invoked assistance from without. Application was made first, to the Athenian Timotheus—next, to the Theban Epaminondas; but neither of them would interfere—nor was there, indeed, any motive to tempt them. At length application was made to the exiled citizen Klearchus.

Continued political troubles at Herakleia —assistance invoked from without.

This exile, now about forty years of age, intelligent, audacious and unprincipled, had passed four years at Athens partly in hearing the lessons of Plato and Isokrates—and had watched with emulous curiosity the brilliant fortune of the despot Dionysius at Syracuse, in whom both these philosophers took interest[1]. During his banishment, moreover, he had done what was common with Grecian exiles; he had taken service with the enemy of his native

Character and circumstances of Klearchus—he makes himself despot of Herakleia—his tyranny and cruelty.

[1] Diodor. xv. 81. ἐζήλωσε μὲν τὴν Διονυσίου τοῦ Συρακουσίου διαγωγὴν, &c. Memnon, Fragm. c. 1; Isokrates, Epist. vii.

It is here that the fragments of Memnon, as abstracted by Photius (Cod. 224), begin. Photius had seen only eight books of Memnon's History of Heraklein (Books ix.–xvi. inclusive); neither the first eight books (see the end of his Excerpta from Memnon), nor those after the sixteenth, had come under his view. This is greatly to be regretted, as we are thus shut out from the knowledge of Heraklean affairs anterior to Klearchus.

It happens, not unfrequently, with Photius, that he does not possess an entire work, but only parts of it; this is a curious fact, in reference to the libraries of the ninth century A.D.

The fragments of Memnon are collected out of Photius, together with those of Nymphis and other Herakleotic historians, and illustrated with

city, the neighbouring prince Mithridates[1], and probably enough against the city itself. As an officer, he distinguished himself much; acquiring renown with the prince and influence over the minds of soldiers. Hence his friends, and a party in Herakleia, became anxious to recall him, as moderator and protector under the grievous political discords prevailing. It was the oligarchical party who invited him to come back, at the head of a body of troops, as their auxiliary in keeping down the plebs. Klearchus accepted their invitation; but with the full purpose of making himself the Dionysius of Herakleia. Obtaining from Mithridates a powerful body of mercenaries, under secret promise to hold the city only as his prefect, he marched thither with the proclaimed purpose of maintaining order, and upholding the government. As his mercenary soldiers were soon found troublesome companions, he obtained permission to construct a separate stronghold in the city, under colour of keeping them apart in the stricter discipline of a barrack[2]. Having thus

useful notes and citations, in the edition of Orelli; as well as by K. Müller, in Didot's Fragm. Hist. Græc. tom. iii. p. 525. Memnon carried his history down to the time of Julius Cæsar, and appears to have lived shortly after the Christian era. Nymphis (whom he probably copied) was much older; having lived seemingly from about 300–230 B.C. (see the few Fragmenta remaining from him, in the same work, iii. p. 12). The work of the Herakleotic author Herodôrus seems to have been altogether upon legendary matter (see Fragm. in the same work, ii. p. 27). He was half a century earlier than Nymphis.

[1] Suidas v. Κλέαρχος.

[2] Polyænus, ii. 30, 1; Justin, xvi. 4. "A quibus revocatus in patriam, per quos in aree collocatus fuerat," &c.

Æneas (Poliorket. c. 12) cites this proceeding as an example of the mistake made by a political party, in calling in a greater number of mercenary auxiliaries than they could manage or keep in order.

secured a strong position, he invited Mithridates into the city, to receive the promised possession; but instead of performing this engagement, he detained the prince as prisoner, and only released him on payment of a considerable ransom. He next cheated, still more grossly, the oligarchy who had recalled him; denouncing their past misrule, declaring himself their mortal enemy, and espousing the pretensions as well as the antipathies of the plebs. The latter willingly seconded him in his measures—even extreme measures of cruelty and spoliation—against their political enemies. A large number of the rich were killed, imprisoned, or impoverished and banished; their slaves or serfs, too, were not only manumitted by order of the new despot, but also married to the wives and daughters of the exiles. The most tragical scenes arose out of these forced marriages; many of the women even killed themselves, some after having first killed their new husbands. Among the exiles, a party, driven to despair, procured assistance from without, and tried to obtain by force readmittance into the city; but they were totally defeated by Klearchus, who after this victory became more brutal and unrelenting than ever[1].

He continues despot for twelve years—he is assassinated at a festival.

He was now in irresistible power; despot of the whole city, plebs as well as oligarchy. Such he continued to be for twelve years; during which he displayed great warlike energy against exterior enemies, together with unabated cruelty towards the citizens. He farther indulged in the most over-

[1] Justin, xvi. 4, 5; Theopompus ap. Athenæ. iii. p. 85. Fragm. 200, ed. Didot.

weening insolence of personal demeanour, adopting an Oriental costume and ornaments, and proclaiming himself the son of Zeus—as Alexander the Great did after him. Amidst all these enormities, however, his literary tastes did not forsake him; he collected a library, at that time a very rare possession[1]. Many were the conspiracies attempted by suffering citizens against this tyrant; but his vigilance baffled and punished all. At length two young men, Chion and Leonides (they too having been among the hearers of Plato), found an opportunity to stab him at a Dionysiac festival. They, with those who seconded them, were slain by his guards, after a gallant resistance; but Klearchus himself died of the wound, in torture and mental remorse[2].

B.C. 352. Satyrus becomes despot—his aggravated cruelty—his military vigour.

His death unfortunately brought no relief to the Herakleots. The two sons whom he left, Timotheus and Dionysius, were both minors; but his brother Satyrus, administering in their name, grasped the sceptre and continued the despotism, with cruelty not merely undiminished, but even aggravated and sharpened by the past assassination. Not inferior to his predecessor in energy and vigilance, Satyrus was in this respect different, that he was altogether rude and unlettered. Moreover he was rigidly scrupulous in preserving the crown for his brother's children, as soon as they should be of age. To ensure to them an undisturbed succession, he took every precaution to avoid begetting children of his

[1] Memnon, c. 1. The seventh Epistle of Isokrates, addressed to Timotheus son of Klearchus, recognises generally this character of the latter; with whose memory Isokrates disclaims all sympathy.

[2] Memnon, c. 1; Justin, xvi. 5; Diodor. xvi. 36.

own by his wife[1]. After a rule of seven years, Satyrus died of a lingering and painful distemper.

B.C. 345. Despotism of Timotheus, just and mild—his energy and ability.

The government of Herakleia now devolved on Timotheus, who exhibited a contrast, alike marked and beneficent, with his father and uncle. Renouncing all their cruelty and constraint, he set at liberty every man whom he found in prison. He was strict in dispensing justice, but mild and even liberal in all his dealings towards the citizens. At the same time, he was a man of adventurous courage, carrying on successful war against foreign enemies, and making his power respected all around. With his younger brother Dionysius, he maintained perfect harmony, treating him as an equal and partner. Though thus using his power generously towards the Herakleots, he was, however, still a despot, and retained the characteristic marks of despotism—the strong citadel, fortified separately from the town, with a commanding mercenary force. After a reign

[1] Memnon, c. 2. *ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὸ πρῶτον ἠνέγκατο· τὴν γὰρ ἀρχὴν τοῖς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ παισὶν ἀνεπηρέαστον σύντηρῶν, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τῆς αὐτῶν κηδεμονίας λόγον ἐτίθετο, ὡς καὶ γυναικὶ συνὼν, καὶ τότε λίαν στεργομένῃ, μὴ ἀνασχέσθαι παιδοποιῆσαι, ἀλλὰ μηχανῇ πάσῃ γονῆς στέρησιν ἑαυτῷ διαθέσθαι, ὡς ἂν μήδ' ὅλως ὑπολίποι τινὰ ἐφεδρεύοντα τοῖς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ παισίν.*

In the Antigonid dynasty of Macedonia, we read that Demetrius, son of Antigonus Gonatas, died leaving his son Philip a boy. Antigonus called Doson, younger brother of Demetrius, assumed the regency on behalf of Philip; he married the widow of Demetrius, and had children by her; but he was so anxious to guard Philip's succession against all chance of being disturbed, that he refused to bring up his own children —*Ὁ δὲ παιδῶν γενομένων ἐκ τῆς Χρυσηίδος, οὐκ ἀνεθρέψατο, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ Φιλίππῳ περισώζων* (Porphyry, Fragm. ap. Didot, Fragm. Histor. Græc. vol. iii. p. 701).

In the Greek and Roman world, the father was generally considered to have the right of determining whether he would or would not bring up a new-born child. The obligation was only supposed to commence when he accepted or sanctioned it, by taking up the child.

of about nine years, he died, deeply mourned by every one[1].

B.C. 336. Despotism of Dionysius—his popular and vigorous government—his prudent dealing with the Macedonians, during the absence of Alexander in the East.

Dionysius, who succeeded him, fell upon unsettled times, full both of hope and fear; opening chances of aggrandisement; yet with many new dangers and uncertainties. The sovereignty which he inherited doubtless included, not simply the city of Herakleia, but also foreign dependencies and possessions in its neighbourhood; for his three predecessors[2] had been all enterprising chiefs, commanding a considerable aggressive force. At the commencement of his reign, indeed, the ascendency of Memnon and the Persian force in the north-western part of Asia Minor was at a higher pitch than ordinary; it appears too that Klearchus—and probably his successors also—had always taken care to keep on the best terms with the Persian court[3]. But presently came the invasion of Alexander (334 B.C.), with the battle of the Granikus, which totally extinguished the Persian power in Asia Minor, and was followed, after no long interval, by the entire conquest of the Persian empire. The Persian control being now removed from Asia Minor—while Alexander with the great Macedonian force merely passed through it to the east, leaving viceroys behind him—new hopes of independence or aggran-

[1] Memnon, c. 3. The Epistle of Isokrates (vii.) addressed to Timotheus in recommendation of a friend, is in harmony with this general character, but gives no new information.

Diodorus reckons Timotheus as immediately succeeding Klearchus his father—considering Satyrus simply as regent (xvi. 36).

[2] We hear of Klearchus as having besieged Astakus (afterwards Nikomedia)—at the interior extremity of the north-eastern indentation of the Propontis, called the Gulf of Astakus (Polyænus, ii. 30, 3).

[3] Memnon, c. 1.

disement began to arise among the native princes in Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Kappadokia. The Bithynian prince even contended successfully in the field against Kalas, who had been appointed by Alexander as satrap in Phrygia[1]. The Herakleot Dionysius, on the other hand, enemy by position of these Bithynians, courted the new Macedonian potentates, playing his political game with much skill in every way. He kept his forces well in hand, and his dominions carefully guarded; he ruled in a mild and popular manner, so as to preserve among the Herakleots the same feelings of attachment which had been inspired by his predecessor. While the citizens of the neighbouring Sinôpê (as has been already related) sent their envoys to Darius, Dionysius kept his eyes upon Alexander; taking care to establish a footing at Pella, and being peculiarly assiduous in attentions to Alexander's sister, the princess Kleopatra[2]. He was the better qualified for this courtly service, as he was a man of elegant and ostentatious tastes, and had purchased from his namesake, the fallen Syracusan Dionysius, all the rich furniture of the Dionysian family, highly available for presents[3].

Return of Alexander to Susa—he is solicited by the Herakleotic exiles—danger of Dionysius, averted by the death of Alexander.

By the favour of Antipater and the regency at Pella, the Herakleotic despot was enabled both to maintain and extend his dominions, until the return of Alexander to Susa and Babylon in 324 B.C. All other authority was now superseded by the personal will of the omnipotent conqueror; who,

[1] Memnon, c. 20.
[2] Memnon, c. 3.
[3] Memnon, c. 3. See in this History, Vol. XI. Ch. lxxxv. p. 217.

mistrusting all his delegates—Antipater, the princesses, and the satraps—listened readily to complainants from all quarters, and took particular pride in espousing the pretensions of Grecian exiles. I have already recounted how, in June 324 B.C., Alexander promulgated at the Olympic festival a sweeping edict, directing that in every Grecian city the exiles should be restored—by force, if force was required. Among the various Grecian exiles, those from Herakleia were not backward in soliciting his support, to obtain their own restoration, as well as the expulsion of the despot. As they were entitled, along with others, to the benefit of the recent edict, the position of Dionysius became one of extreme danger. He now reaped the full benefit of his antecedent prudence, in having maintained both his popularity with the Herakleots at home, and his influence with Antipater, to whom the enforcement of the edict was entrusted. He was thus enabled to ward off the danger for a time; and his good fortune rescued him from it altogether, by the death of Alexander in June 323 B.C. That event, coming as it did unexpectedly upon every one, filled Dionysius with such extravagant joy, that he fell into a swoon; and he commemorated it by erecting a statue in honour of Euthymia, or the tranquillising Goddess. His position however seemed again precarious, when the Herakleotic exiles renewed their solicitations to Perdikkas; who favoured their cause, and might probably have restored them, if he had chosen to direct his march towards the Hellespont against Antipater and Kra-

terus, instead of undertaking the ill-advised expedition against Egypt, wherein he perished[1].

B.C. 322–304. Prosperity and prudence of Dionysius—he marries Amastris—his favour with Antigonus—his death.

The tide of fortune now turned more than ever in favour of Dionysius. With Antipater and Kraterus, the preponderant potentates in his neighbourhood, he was on the best terms; and it happened at this juncture to suit the political views of Kraterus to dismiss his Persian wife Amastris (niece of the late Persian king Darius, and conferred upon Kraterus by Alexander when he himself married Statira), for the purpose of espousing Phila daughter of Antipater. Amastris was given in marriage to Dionysius; for him, a splendid exaltation—attesting the personal influence which he had previously acquired. His new wife, herself a woman of ability and energy, brought to him a large sum from the regal treasure, as well as the means of greatly extending his dominion round Herakleia. Noway corrupted by this good fortune, he still persevered both in his conciliating rule at home, and his prudent alliances abroad, making himself especially useful to Antigonus. That great chief, preponderant throughout most parts of Asia Minor, was establishing his ascendency in Bithynia and the neighbourhood of the Propontis, by founding the city of Antigonia in the rich plain adjoining the Askanian Lake[2]. Dionysius lent effective maritime aid to Antigonus, in that war which ended by his conquest of Cyprus from the Egyptian Ptolemy (307 B.C.). To the other Ptolemy, nephew and general of Antigonus, Dionysius gave his daughter in marriage; and he even felt himself

[1] Memnon, c. 4.

[2] Strabo, xii. p. 565.

powerful enough to assume the title of king, after Antigonus, Lysimachus, and the Egyptian Ptolemy had done the like[1]. He died, after reigning thirty years with consummate political skill and uninterrupted prosperity—except that during the last few years he lost his health from excessive corpulence[2].

B.C. 304. Amastris governs Herakleia—marries Lysimachus—is divorced from him—Klearchus and Oxathres kill Amastris—are killed by Lysimachus.

Dionysius left three children under age—Klearchus, Oxathres and a daughter—by his wife Amastris; whom he constituted regent, and who, partly through the cordial support of Antigonus, maintained the Herakleotic dominion unimpaired. Presently Lysimachus, king of Thrace and of the Thracian Chersonese (on the isthmus of which he had founded the city of Lysimacheia), coveted this as a valuable alliance, paid his court to Amastris, and married her. The Herakleotic queen thus enjoyed double protection, and was enabled to avoid taking part in the formidable conflict of Ipsus (300 B.C.); wherein the allies Lysimachus, Kassander, Ptolemy, and Seleukus were victorious over Antigonus. The latter being slain, and his Asiatic power crushed, Lysimachus got possession of Antigonia, the recent foundation of his rival in Bithynia, and changed its name to Nikæa[3]. After a certain time, however, Lysimachus became desirous of marrying Arsinoê, daughter of the Egyptian Ptolemy; accordingly, Amastris divorced herself from him, and set up for

[1] Memnon, c. 4: compare Diodor. xx. 53.

[2] Nymphis, Fragm. 16. ap. Athenæum, xii. p. 549; Ælian, V. H. ix. 13.

[3] Strabo, xii. p. 565. So also Antioch, on the Orontes in Syria, the great foundation of Seleukus Nikator, was established on or near the site of another Antigonia, also previously founded by Antigonus Monophthalmus (Strabo, xv. p. 750).

herself separately as regent of Herakleia. Her two sons being now nearly of age, she founded and fortified, for her own residence, the neighbouring city of Amastris, about sixty miles eastward of Herakleia on the coast of the Euxine[1]. These young men, Klearchus and Oxathres, assumed the government of Herakleia, and entered upon various warlike enterprises; of which we know only, that Klearchus accompanied Lysimachus in his expedition against the Getæ, sharing the fate of that prince, who was defeated and taken prisoner. Both afterwards obtained their release, and Klearchus returned to Herakleia; where he ruled in a cruel and oppressive manner, and even committed the enormity (in conjunction with his brother Oxathres) of killing his mother Amastris. This crime was avenged by her former husband Lysimachus; who, coming to Herakleia under professions of friendship (B.C. 286), caused Klearchus and Oxathres to be put to death, seized their treasure, and keeping separate possession of the citadel only, allowed the Herakleots to establish a popular government[2].

Arsinoê mistress of Herakleia. Defeat and death of Lysimachus. Power of Seleukus.

Lysimachus, however, was soon persuaded by his wife Arsinoê to make over Herakleia to her, as it had been formerly possessed by Amastris; and Arsinoê sent thither a Kymæan officer named Herakleides, who carried with him force sufficient to re-establish the former despotism, with its oppressions and cruelties. For other purposes too, not less mischievous, the influence of Arsinoê was all-powerful. She prevailed upon Lysimachus to

[1] Strabo, xii. p. 544.

[2] Memnon, c. 6.

kill his eldest son (by a former marriage) Agathokles, a young prince of the most estimable and eminent qualities. Such an atrocity, exciting universal abhorrence among the subjects of Lysimachus, enabled his rival Seleukus to attack him with success. In a great battle fought between these two princes, Lysimachus was defeated and slain—by the hand and javelin of a citizen of Herakleia, named Malakon[1].

B.C. 281. Herakleia emancipated from the despots, and a popular government established—recall of the exiles—bold bearing of the citizens towards Seleukus—death of Seleukus.

This victory transferred the dominions of the vanquished prince to Seleukus. At Herakleia too, its effect was so powerful, that the citizens were enabled to shake off their despotism. They at first tried to make terms with the governor Herakleides, offering him money as an inducement to withdraw. From him they obtained only an angry refusal; yet his subordinate officers of mercenaries, and commanders of detached posts in the Herakleotic territory, mistrusting their own power of holding out, accepted an amicable compromise with the citizens, who tendered to them full liquidation of arrears of pay, together with the citizenship. The Herakleots were thus enabled to discard Herakleides, and regain their popular government. They signalised their revolution by the impressive ceremony of demolishing their Bastile—the detached fort or stronghold within the city, which had served for eighty-four years as the characteristic symbol, and indispensable engine, of the antecedent despotism[2]. The city, now again a free commonwealth, was farther reinforced by the junction of Nymphis (the historian) and other Herakleotic

[1] Memnon, c. 7, 8. [2] Memnon, c. 9; Strabo, xii. p. 542.

citizens, who had hitherto been in exile. These men were restored, and welcomed by their fellow-citizens in full friendship and harmony; yet with express proviso, that no demand should be made for the restitution of their properties, long since confiscated[1]. To the victor Seleukus, however, and his officer Aphrodisius, the bold bearing of the newly-emancipated Herakleots proved offensive. They would probably have incurred great danger from him, had not his mind been first set upon the conquest of Macedonia, in the accomplishment of which he was murdered by Ptolemy Keraunus.

Situation and management of Herakleia as a free government—considerable naval power.

The Herakleots thus became again a commonwealth of free citizens, without any detached citadel or mercenary garrison; yet they lost, seemingly through the growing force and aggressions of some inland dynasts, several of their outlying dependencies—Kierus, Tium, and Amastris. The two former they recovered some time afterwards by purchase, and they wished also to purchase back Amastris; but Eumenes, who held it, hated them so much, that he repudiated their money, and handed over the place gratuitously to the Kappadokian chief Ariobarzanes[2]. That their maritime power was at this time very great, we may see by the astonishing account given of their immense

[1] Memnon, c. 11.

[2] Memnon, c. 16. The inhabitants of Byzantium also purchased for a considerable sum the important position called the Ἱερὸν, at the entrance of the Euxine on the Asiatic side (Polybius, iv. 50).

These are rare examples, in ancient history, of cities acquiring territory or dependencies *by purchase*. Acquisitions were often made in this manner by the free German, Swiss, and Italian cities of mediæval Europe; but as to the Hellenic cities, I have not had occasion to record many such transactions in the course of this history.

ships,—numerously manned, and furnished with many brave combatants on the deck—which fought with eminent distinction in the naval battle between Ptolemy Keraunus (murderer and successor of Seleukus) and Antigonus Gonatas[1].

Prudent administration of Herakleia, as a free city, among the powerful princes of Asia Minor—general condition and influence of the Greek cities on the coast.

It is not my purpose to follow lower down the destinies of Herakleia. It maintained its internal autonomy, with considerable maritime power, a dignified and prudent administration, and a partial, though sadly circumscribed, liberty of foreign action—until the successful war of the Romans against Mithridates (B.C. 69). In Asia Minor, the Hellenic cities on the coast were partly enabled to postpone the epoch of their subjugation, by the great division of power which prevailed in the interior; for the potentates of Bithynia, Pergamus, Kappadokia, Pontus, Syria, were in almost perpetual discord—while all of them were menaced by the intrusion of the warlike and predatory Gauls, who extorted for themselves settlements in Galatia (B.C. 276). The kings, the enemies of civic freedom, were kept partially in check by these new and formidable neighbours[2], who were themselves however hardly less formidable to the Grecian cities on the coast[3]. Sinôpê, Herakleia, Byzantium,—and even Rhodes, in spite of the advantage of an insular position,—isolated relicts of what had once been an Hellenic aggregate, become from henceforward cribbed and confined by inland neighbours almost at their gates[4].

[1] Memnon, c. 13: compare Polyb. xviii. 34.

[2] This is a remarkable observation made by Memnon, c. 19.

[3] See the statement of Polybius, xxii. 24.

[4] Contrast the independent and commanding position occupied by Byzantium in 399 B.C., acknowledging no superior except Sparta (Xenoph. Anab. vii. 1)—with its condition in the third century B.C.—

—dependent on the barbaric potentates, between whom they were compelled to trim, making themselves useful in turn to all. It was however frequent wtih these barbaric princes to derive their wives, mistresses, ministers, negotiators, officers, engineers, literati, artists, actors, and intermediate agents both for ornament and recreation—from some Greek city. Among them all, more or less of Hellenic influence became thus insinuated; along with the Greek language which spread its roots everywhere—even among the Gauls or Galatians, the rudest and latest of the foreign immigrants.

Grecian Pentapolis on the south-west of the Euxine—Ovid at Tomi.

Of the Grecian maritime towns in the Euxine south of the Danube—Apollonia, Mesembria, Odêssus, Kallatis, Tomi, and Istrus—five (seemingly without Tomi) formed a confederate Pentapolis[1]. About the year 312 B.C., we hear of them as under the power of Lysimachus king of Thrace, who kept

harassed and pillaged almost to the gates of the town by the neighbouring Thracians and Gauls, and only purchasing immunity by continued money payments: see Polybius, iv. 45.

[1] Strabo, vii. p. 319. Philip of Macedon defeated the Scythian prince Atheas or Ateas (about 340 B.C.) somewhere between Mount Hæmus and the Danube (Justin, ix. 2). But the relations of Ateas with the towns of Istrus and Apollonia, which are said to have brought Philip into the country, are very difficult to understand. It is most probable that these cities invited Philip as their defender.

In Inscription, No. 2056 c. (in Boeckh's Corp. Inscript. Græc. part xi. p. 79), the five cities constituting the Pentapolis are not clearly named. Boeckh supposes them to be Apollonia, Mesembria, Odêssus, Kallatis, and Tomi; but Istrus seems more probable than Tomi. Odêssus was on the site of the modern Varna, where the Inscription was found; greatly south of the modern town of Odessa, which is on the site of another town *Ordêsus*.

An Inscription (2056) immediately preceding the above, also found at Odêssus, contains a vote of thanks and honours to a certain citizen of Antioch, who resided with ..... (name imperfect), king of the Scythians, and rendered great service to the Greeks by his influence.

a garrison in Kallatis—probably in the rest also. They made a struggle to shake off his yoke, obtaining assistance from some of the neighbouring Thracians and Scythians, as well as from Antigonus. But Lysimachus, after a contest which seems to have lasted three or four years, overpowered both their allies and them, reducing them again into subjection[1]. Kallatis sustained a long siege, dismissing some of its ineffective residents; who were received and sheltered by Eumelus prince of Bosporus. It was in pushing his conquests yet farther northward, in the steppe between the rivers Danube and Dniester, that Lysimachus came into conflict with the powerful prince of the Getæ—Dromichætes; by whom he was defeated and captured, but generously released[2]. I have already mentioned that the empire of Lysimachus ended with his last defeat and death by Seleukus—(281 B.C.). By his death, the cities of the Pontic Pentapolis regained a temporary independence. But their barbaric neighbours became more and more formidable, being reinforced seemingly by immigration of fresh hordes from Asia; thus the Sarmatians, who in Herodotus's time were on the east of the Tanais, appear, three centuries afterwards, even south of the Danube. By these tribes—Thracians, Getæ, Scythians, and Sarmatians—the Greek cities of this Pentapolis were successively pillaged. Though renewed indeed afterwards, from the necessity of some place of traffic, even for the pillagers themselves—they were but poorly renewed, with a

[1] Diodor. xix. 73; xx. 25.

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 302-305; Pausanias, i. 9, 5.

large infusion of barbaric residents[1]. Such was the condition in which the exile Ovid found Tomi, near the beginning of the Christian era. The Tomitans were more than half barbaric, and their Greek not easily intelligible. The Sarmatian or Getic horse-bowmen, with their poisoned arrows, ever hovered near, galloped even up to the gates, and carried off the unwary cultivators into slavery. Even within a furlong of the town, there was no security either for person or property.' The residents were clothed in skins, or leather; while the women, ignorant both of spinning and weaving, were employed either in grinding corn or in carrying on their heads the pitchers of water[2].

Olbia—in the days of Herodotus and Ephorus—increased numbers, and inroads of the barbaric hordes.

By these same barbarians, Olbia also (on the right bank of the Hypanis or Bug near its mouth) became robbed of that comfort and prosperity which it had enjoyed when visited by Herodotus. In his day, the Olbians lived on good terms with the Scythian tribes in their neighbourhood. They paid a stipulated tribute, giving presents besides to the prince and his immediate favourites; and on these conditions, their persons and properties were respected. The Scythian prince Skylês (son of an

[1] Dion. Chrysost. Orat. xxxvi. (Borysthenitica) p. 75, Reisk. εἶλον δὲ καὶ ταύτην (Olbia) Γέται, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀριστέροις τοῦ Πόντου πόλεις, μέχρι Ἀπολλωνίας· ὅθεν δὴ καὶ σφόδρα ταπεινὰ τὰ πράγματα κατέστη τῶν ταύτῃ Ἑλλήνων· τῶν μὲν οὐκέτι συνοικισθεισῶν πόλεων, τῶν δὲ φαυλῶς, καὶ τῶν πλείστων βαρβάρων εἰς αὐτὰς συρρεόντων.

[2] The picture drawn by Ovid, of his situation as an exile at Tomi, can never fail to interest, from the mere beauty and felicity of his expression; but it is not less interesting, as a real description of Hellenism in its last phase, degraded and overborne by adverse fates. The truth of Ovid's picture is fully borne out by the analogy of Olbia, pre-

Hellenic mother from Istrus, who had familiarised him with Greek speech and letters) had built a fine house in the town, and spent in it a month, from attachment to Greek manners and religion, while his Scythian army lay near the gates without molesting any one[1]. It is true, that this proceeding cost Skyles

sently to be mentioned. His complaints run through the five books of the Tristia, and the four books of Epistolæ ex Ponto (Trist. v. 10, 15).

"Innumeræ circa gentes fera bella minantur,
Quæ sibi non rapto vivere turpe putant.
Nil extra tutum est: tumulus defenditur ægre
Mœnibus exiguis ingenioque soli.
Cum minime credas, ut avis, densissimus hostis
Advolat, et prædam vix bene visus agit.
Sæpe intra muros clausis venientia portis
Per medias legimus noxia tela vias.
Est igitur rarus, rus qui colere audeat, isque
Hac arat infelix, hac tenet arma manu.
Vix ope castelli defendimur: et tamen intus
Mista facit Græcis barbara turba metum.
Quippe simul nobis habitat discrimine nullo
Barbarus, et tecti plus quoque parte tenet.
Quos ut non timeas, possis odisse, videndo
Pellibus et longâ corpora tecta comâ.
Hos quoque, qui geniti Graiâ creduntur ab urbe,
Pro patrio cultu Persica bracca tegit," &c.

This is a specimen out of many others: compare Trist. iii. 10, 53; iv. 1, 67; Epist. Pont. iii. 1.

Ovid dwells especially upon the fact that there was more of barbaric than of Hellenic speech at Tomi—"Graiaque quod Getico victa loquela sono est" (Trist. v. 2, 68). Woollen clothing, and the practice of spinning and weaving by the free women of the family, were among the most familiar circumstances of Grecian life; the absence of these feminine arts, and the use of skins or leather for clothing, were notable departures from Grecian habits (Ex Ponto, iii. 8):—

"Vellera dura ferunt pecudes; et Palladis uti
Arte Tomitanæ non didicere nurus.
Femina pro lanâ Cerealia munera frangit,
Suppositoque gravem vertice portat aquam."

[1] Herodot. iv. 16–18. The town was called *Olbia* by its inhabitants, but *Borysthenes* usually by foreigners; though it was not on the Borysthenes river (Dnieper), but on the right bank of the Hypanis (Bug).

his life; for the Scythians would not tolerate their own prince in the practice of foreign religious rites, though they did not quarrel with the same rites when observed by the Greeks[1]. To their own customs the Scythians adhered tenaciously, and those customs were often sanguinary, ferocious, and brutish. Still they were warriors, rather than robbers—they abstained from habitual pillage, and maintained with the Greeks a reputation for honesty and fair dealing, which became proverbial with the early poets. Such were the Scythians as seen by Herodotus (probably about 440 to 430 B.C.); and the picture drawn by Ephorus a century afterwards (about 340 B.C.) appears to have been not materially different[2]. But after that time it gradually altered. New tribes seem to have come in—the Sarmatians out of the East—the Gauls out of the West; from Thrace northward to the Tanais and the Palus Mæotis, the most different tribes became intermingled—Gauls, Thracians, Getæ, Scythians, Sarmatians, &c.[3] Olbia was in an open plain, with no defence except its walls and the adjoining river Hypanis, frozen over in the winter. The hybrid Helleno-Scythian race, formed by intermarriages of Greeks with Scythians—and

[1] Herodot. iv. 76–80.

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 302; Skymnus Chius, v. 112, who usually follows Ephorus.

The rhetor Dion tells us (Orat. xxxvi. init.) that he went to Olbia in order that he might *go through the Scythians to the Getæ*. This shows that in his time (about A.D. 100) the Scythians must have been between the Bug and Dniester—the Getæ nearer to the Danube—just as they had been four centuries earlier. But many new hordes were mingled with them.

[3] Strabo, vii. p. 296–304.

the various Scythian tribes who had become partially sedentary cultivators of corn for exportation —had probably also acquired habits less warlike than the tribes of primitive barbaric type. At any rate, even if capable of defending themselves, they could not continue their production and commerce under repeated hostile incursions.

Olbia in later days —decline of security and production.

A valuable inscription remaining enables us to compare the Olbia (or Borysthenes) seen by Herodotus, with the same town in the second century B.C.[1]. At this latter period, the city was diminished in population, impoverished in finances, exposed to constantly increasing exactions and menace from the passing barbaric hordes, and scarcely able to defend against them even the security of its walls. Some-

[1] This Inscription—No. 2058—in Boeckh's Inscr. Græc. part xi. p. 121 *seq.*—is among the most interesting in that noble collection. It records a vote of public gratitude and honour to a citizen of Olbia named Protogenes, and recites the valuable services which he as well as his father had rendered to the city. It thus describes the numerous situations of difficulty and danger from which he had contributed to extricate them. A vivid picture is presented to us of the distress of the city. The introduction prefixed by Boeckh (p. 86-89) is also very instructive.

Olbia is often spoken of by the name of *Borysthenes*, which name was given to it by foreigners, but not recognized by the citizens. Nor was it even situated on the Borysthenes river; but on the right or western bank of the Hypanis (Bug) river; not far from the modern Oczakoff.

The date of the above Inscription is not specified, and has been differently determined by various critics. Niebuhr assigns it (Untersuchungen über die Skythen, &c. in his Kleine Schriften, p. 387) to a time near the close of the second Punic war. Boeckh also believes that it is not much after that epoch. The terror inspired by the Gauls, even to other barbarians, appears to suit the second century B.C. better than it suits a later period.

The Inscription No. 2059 attests the great number of strangers resident at Olbia; strangers from eighteen different cities, of which the most remote is Miletus, the mother-city of Olbia.

times there approached the barbaric chief Saitapharnes with his personal suite, sometimes his whole tribe or horde in mass, called Saii. Whenever they came, they required to be appeased by presents, greater than the treasury could supply, and borrowed only from the voluntary help of rich citizens; while even these presents did not always avert ill treatment or pillage. Already the citizens of Olbia had repelled various attacks, partly by taking into pay a semi-Hellenic population in their neighhourhood (Mix-Hellenes, like the Liby-Phenicians in Africa); but the inroads became more alarming, and their means of defence less, through the uncertain fidelity of these Mix-Hellenes, as well as of their own slaves—the latter probably barbaric natives purchased from the interior[1]. In the midst of public poverty, it was necessary to enlarge and strengthen the fortifications; for they were threatened with the advent of the Gauls—who inspired such terror that the Scythians and other barbarians were likely to seek their own safety by extorting admission within the walls of Olbia. Moreover even corn was scarce, and extravagantly dear. There had been repeated failures in the produce of the lands around, famine was apprehended, and efforts were needed, greater than the treasury could sustain, to lay in a stock at the public expense. Among the many points of contrast with Herodotus, this is perhaps the most striking; for in his time, corn was the great pro-

[1] On one occasion, we know not when, the citizens of Olbia are said to have been attacked by one Zopyrion, and to have succeeded in resisting him only by emancipating their slaves, and granting the citizenship to foreigners (Macrobius, Saturnal. i. 11).

duce and the principal export from Olbia; the growth had now been suspended, or was at least perpetually cut off, by increased devastation and insecurity.

Olbia pillaged and abandoned—afterwards renewed.

After perpetual attacks, and even several captures, by barbaric neighbours—this unfortunate city, about fifty years before the Christian era, was at length so miserably sacked by the Getæ, as to become for a time abandoned[1]. Presently, however, the fugitives partially returned, to re-establish themselves on a reduced scale. For the very same barbarians who had persecuted and plundered them, still required an emporium with a certain amount of import and export, such as none but Greek settlers could provide; moreover it was from the coast near Olbia, and from the care of its inhabitants, that many of the neighbouring tribes derived their supply of salt[2]. Hence arose a puny after-growth of Olbia—preserving the name, traditions, and part of the locality, of the deserted city—by the return of a portion of the colonists with an infusion of Scythian or Sarmatian residents; an infusion indeed so large, as seriously to dishellenise both the speech and the personal names in the town[3].

Visit of Dion the rhetor—Hellenic tastes and manners—ardent interest in Homer.

To this second edition of Olbia, the rhetor Dion Chrysostom paid a summer visit (about a century after the Christian era), of which he has left a brief but interesting account. Within the wide area once filled by the original Olbia—the former circum-

[1] Dion Chrys. (Or. xxxvi. p. 75)—ἀεὶ μὲν πολεμεῖται, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐάλωκε, &c.

[2] Dion Chrysost. Orat. xxxvi. (Borysthenit.) p. 75, 76, Reisk.

[3] See Boeckh's Commentary on the language and the personal names of the Olbian Inscriptions, part xi. p. 108-116.

ference of which was marked by crumbling walls and towers—the second town occupied a narrow corner; with poor houses, low walls, and temples having no other ornament except the ancient statues mutilated by the plunderers. The citizens dwelt in perpetual insecurity, constantly under arms or on guard; for the barbaric horsemen, in spite of sentinels posted to announce their approach, often carried off prisoners, cattle, or property, from the immediate neighbourhood of the gates. The picture drawn of Olbia by Dion confirms in a remarkable way that given of Tomi by Ovid. And what imparts to it a touching interest is, that the Greeks whom Dion saw contending with the difficulties, privations, and dangers of this inhospitable outpost, still retained the activity, the elegance, and the intellectual aspirations of their Ionic breed; in this respect much superior to the Tomitans of Ovid. In particular, they were passionate admirers of Homer; a considerable proportion of the Greeks of Olbia could repeat the Iliad from memory[1]. Achilles (localised under the surmane of Pontarches, on numerous islands and capes in the Euxine) was

[1] Dion, Orat. xxxvi. (Borysthenit.), p. 78, Reiske. .....καὶ τἆλλα μὲν οὐκέτι σαφῶς ἑλληνίζοντες, διὰ τὸ ἐν μέσοις οἰκεῖν τοῖς βαρβάροις, ὅμως τήν γε Ἰλιάδα ὀλίγου πάντες ἴσασιν ἀπὸ στόματος. I translate the words ὀλίγου πάντες with some allowance for rhetoric.

The representation given by Dion of the youthful citizen of Olbia—Kallistratus—with whom he conversed, is curious as a picture of Greek manners in this remote land; a youth of eighteen years of age, with genuine Ionic features, and conspicuous for his beauty (εἶχε πολλοὺς ἐραστάς); a zealot for literature and philosophy, but especially for Homer; clothed in the costume of the place, suited for riding—the long leather trowsers, and short black cloak; constantly on horseback for defence of the town, and celebrated as a warrior even at that early age, having already killed or made prisoners several Sarmatians (p. 77).

among the chief divine or heroic persons to whom they addressed their prayers[1]. Amidst Grecian life, thus degraded and verging towards its extinction, and stripped even of the purity of living speech—the thread of imaginative and traditional sentiment thus continues without suspension or abatement.

Bosporus or Pantikapæum.

Respecting Bosporus or Pantikapæum (for both names denote the same city, though the former name often comprehends the whole annexed dominion), founded by Milesian settlers[2] on the European side of the Kimmerian Bosporus (near Kertsch), we first hear, about the period when Xerxes was repulsed from Greece (480–479 B.C.). It was the centre of a dominion including Phanagoria, Kepi, Hermonassa, and other Greek cities on the Asiatic side of the strait; and is said to have been governed by what seems to have been an oligarchy—called the Archæanaktidæ, for forty-two years[3] (480–438 B.C.).

Princes of Bosporus—relations between Athens and Bosporus.

After them we have a series of princes standing out individually by name, and succeeding each other in the same family. Spartokus I. was succeeded by Seleukus; next comes Spartokus II.; then Satyrus I. (407–393 B.C.); Leukon (393–353 B.C.); Spartokus III. (353–348 B.C.); Parisades I. (348–310 B.C.); Satyrus II., Prytanis, Eumelus (310–304 B.C.); Spartokus IV. (304–284 B.C.); Parisades II.[4] During the reigns of these princes,

[1] See Inscriptions, Nos. 2076, 2077, ap. Boeckh; and Arrian's Periplus of the Euxine, ap. Geogr. Minor. p. 21, ed. Hudson.

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 310.

[3] Diodor. xii. 31.

[4] See Mr. Clinton's Appendix on the Kings of Bosporus—Fast. Hellen. App. c. 13. p. 280, &c.; and Boeckh's Commentary on the same subject, Inscript. Græc. part xi. p. 91 *seq.*

a connexion of some intimacy subsisted between Athens and Bosporus; a connexion not political, since the Bosporanic princes had little interest in the contentions about Hellenic hegemony—but of private intercourse, commercial interchange, and reciprocal good offices. The eastern corner of the Tauric Chersonesus, between Pantikapæum and Theodosia, was well-suited for the production of corn; while plenty of fish, as well as salt, was to be had in or near the Palus Mæotis. Corn, salted fish and meat, hides, and barbaric slaves in considerable numbers, were in demand among all the Greeks round the Ægean, and not least at Athens, where Scythian slaves were numerous[1]; while oil and wine, with other products of more southern regions, were acceptable in Bosporus and the other Pontic ports. This important traffic seems to have been mainly carried on in ships and by capital belonging to Athens and other Ægæan maritime towns; and must have been greatly under the protection and regulation of the Athenians, so long as their maritime empire subsisted. Enterprising citizens of Athens went to Bosporus (as to Thrace

[1] Polybius (iv. 38) enumerates the principal articles of this Pontic trade; among the exports *τά τε δέρματα καὶ τὸ τῶν εἰς τὰς δουλείας ἀγομένων σωμάτων πλῆθος*, &c., where Schweighhäuser has altered *δέρματα* to *θρέμματα*, seemingly on the authority of one MS. only. I doubt the propriety of this change, as well as the fact of any large exportation of live cattle from the Pontus; whereas the exportation of hides was considerable: see Strabo, xi. p. 493.

The Scythian public slaves or policemen of Athens are well known. *Σκύθαινα* also is the name of a female slave (Aristoph. Lysistr. 184). *Σκύθης*, for the name of a slave, occurs as early as Theognis, v. 826.

Some of the salted preparations from the Pontus were extravagantly dear; Cato complained of a *κεράμιον Ποντικῶν ταρίχων* as sold for 300 drachmæ (Polyb. xxxi. 24).

and the Thracian Chersonesus), to push their fortunes; merchants from other cities found it advantageous to settle as resident strangers or metics at Athens, where they were more in contact with the protecting authority, and obtained readier access to the judicial tribunals. It was probably during the period preceding the great disaster at Syracuse in 413 B.C., that Athens first acquired her position as a mercantile centre for the trade with the Euxine; which we afterwards find her retaining, even with reduced power, in the time of Demosthenes.

Nymphæum among the tributary cities under the Athenian empire—here it passed under the Bosporanic princes.

How strong was the position enjoyed by Athens in Bosporus, during her unimpaired empire, we may judge from the fact, that Nymphæum (south of Pantikapæum, between that town and Theodosia) was among her tributary towns, and paid a talent annually[1]. Not until the misfortunes of Athens in the closing years of the Peloponnesian war, did Nymphæum pass into the hands of the Bosporanic princes; betrayed (according to Æschines) by the maternal grandfather of Demosthenes, the Athenian Gylon; who however probably did nothing more than obey a necessity rendered unavoidable by the fallen condition of Athens[2]. We thus see that Nymphæum, in the midst of the Bosporanic dominion, was not only a member of the Athenian empire, but also contained influential Athenian citizens, engaged in the corn-

[1] Harpokration and Photius, v. Νυμφαῖον—from the ψηφίσματα collected by Kraterus. Compare Boeckh, in the second edition of his Staatshaushaltung der Athener, vol. ii. p. 658.

[2] Æschines adv. Ktesiph. p. 78. c. 57. See my last preceding Vol. XI. Ch. lxxxvii. p. 369.

trade. Gylon was rewarded by a large grant of land at Kepi—probably other Athenians of Nymphæum were rewarded also—by the Bosporanic prince, who did not grudge a good price for such an acquisition. We find also other instances,—both of Athenian citizens sent out to reside with the prince Satyrus,—and of Pontic Greeks who, already in correspondence and friendship with various individual Athenians, consign their sons to be initiated in the commerce, society, and refinements of Athens[1]. Such facts attest the correspondence and intercourse of that city, during her imperial greatness, with Bosporus.

Alliance and reciprocal good offices between Satyrus, Leukon, &c. and the Athenians. Immunities of trade granted to the Athenians.

The Bosporanic prince Satyrus was in the best relations with Athens, and even seems to have had authorised representatives there to enforce his requests, which met with very great attention[2]. He treated the Athenian merchants at Bosporus with equity and even favour, granting to them a preference in the export of corn when there was not enough for all[3]. His son Leukon not only con-

[1] Lysias, pro Mantitheo, Or. xvi. s. 4; Isokrates (Trapezitic.), Or. xvii. s. 5. The young man, whose case Isokrates sets forth, was sent to Athens by his father Sopæus, a rich Pontic Greek (s. 52) much in the confidence of Satyrus. Sopæus furnished his son with two ship-loads of corn, and with money besides—and then despatched him to Athens ἅμα κατ' ἐμπορίαν καὶ κατὰ θεωρίαν.

[2] Isokrates, Trapez. s. 5, 6. Sopæus, father of this pleader, had incurred the suspicions of Satyrus in the Pontus, and had been arrested; upon which Satyrus sends to Athens to seize the property of the son, to order him home,—and if he refused, then to require the Athenians to deliver him up—ἐπιστέλλει δὲ τοῖς ἐνθάδε ἐπιδημοῦσιν ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου τά τε χρήματα παρ' ἐμοῦ κομίσασθαι, &c.

[3] Isokrates, Trapezit. s. 71. Demosthenes also recognizes favours from Satyrus—καὶ αὐτὸς (Leukon) καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι, &c. (adv. Leptin. p. 467).

tinued the preference to Athenian exporting ships, but also granted to them remission of the export duty (of one-thirtieth part), which he exacted from all other traders. Such an exemption is reckoned as equivalent to an annual present of 13,000 medimni of corn (the medimnus being about $1\frac{1}{3}$ bushel); the total quantity of corn brought from Bosporus to Athens in a full year being 400,000 medimni[1]. It is easy to see moreover that such a premium must have thrown nearly the whole exporting trade into the hands of Athenian merchants. The Athenians requited this favour by public votes of gratitude and honour, conferring upon Leukon the citizenship, together with immunity from all the regular burthens attaching to property at Athens. There was lying in that city money belonging to Leukon[2]; who was therefore open (under the proposition of Leptines) to that conditional summons for exchange of properties, technically termed Antidosis. In his time, moreover, the corn-trade of Bosporus appears to have been farther extended; for we learn that he established an export from Theodosia as well as from Pantikapæum. His successor Parisades I. continuing to Athenian exporters of corn the same privilege of immunity from export duty, obtained from Athens still higher honours than Leukon; for we learn that his statue, together with those of two relatives, was erected in the agora, on the motion of Demosthenes[3]. The connexion of Bosporus with Athens

[1] Demosth. adv. Leptin., p. 467.
[2] Demosth. adv. Leptin., p. 469.
[3] Demosth. adv. Phormion., p. 917; Deinarchus adv. Demosth., p. 34.

was durable as well as intimate; its corn-trade being of high importance to the subsistence of the people. Every Athenian exporter was bound by law to bring his cargo in the first instance to Athens. The freighting and navigating of ships for that purpose, together with the advance of money by rich capitalists (citizens and metics) upon interest and conditions enforced by the Athenian judicature, was a standing and profitable business. And we may appreciate the value of equitable treatment, not to say favour, from the kings of Bosporus—when we contrast it with the fraudulent and extortionate behaviour of Kleomenes, satrap of Egypt, in reference to the export of Egyptian corn[1].

Political condition of the Greeks of Bosporus —the princes called themselves archons—their empire over barbaric tribes.

The political condition of the Greeks at Bosporus was somewhat peculiar. The hereditary princes (above enumerated), who ruled them substantially as despots, assumed no other title (in respect to the Greeks) than that of Archon. They paid tribute to the powerful Scythian tribes who bounded them on the European side, and even thought it necessary to carry a ditch across the narrow isthmus, from some point near Theodosia northward to the Palus Mæotis, as a protection against incursions[2]. Their dominion did not extend farther west than Theodosia; this ditch was their

The name stands Berisades as printed in the oration; but it is plain that Parisades is the person designated. See Boeckh, Introd. ad Inscr. No. 2056, p. 92.

Deinarchus avers, that Demosthenes received an annual present of 1000 modii of corn from Bosporus.

[1] Demosthen. adv. Dionysodor. p. 1285.

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 310, 311.

extreme western boundary; and even for the land within it, they paid tribute. But on the Asiatic side of the strait, they were lords paramount for a considerable distance, over the feebler and less warlike tribes who pass under the common name of Mæotæ or Mæêtæ—the Sindi, Toreti, Dandarii, Thatês, &c. Inscriptions, yet remaining, of Parisades I. record him as King of these various barbaric tribes, but as Archon of Bosporus and Theodosia[1]. His dominion on the Asiatic side of the Kimmerian Bosporus, sustained by Grecian and Thracian mercenaries, was of considerable (though to us unknown) extent, reaching to somewhere near the borders of Caucasus[2].

B.C. 310–304. Family feuds among the Bosporanic princes—war between Satyrus and Eumelus—death of Satyrus II.

Parisades I. on his death left three sons—Satyrus, Prytanis, and Eumelus. Satyrus, as the eldest, succeeded; but Eumelus claimed the crown, sought aid without, and prevailed on various neighbours—among them a powerful Thracian king named Ariopharnes—to espouse his cause. At the head of an army said to consist of 20,000 horse and

[1] See Inscript. Nos. 2117, 2118, 2119, in Boeckh's Collection, p. 156. In the Memorabilia of Xenophon (ii. 1, 10), Sokrates cites the Scythians as an example of ruling people, and the Mæotæ as an example of subjects. Probably this refers to the position of the Bosporanic Greeks, who paid tribute to the Scythians, but ruled over the Mæotæ. The name *Mæotæ* seems confined to tribes on the Asiatic side of the Palus Mæotis; while the Scythians were on the European side of that sea. Sokrates and the Athenians had good means of being informed about the situation of the Bosporani and their neighbours on both sides. See K. Neumann, Die Hellenen im Skythenlande, b. ii. p. 216.

[2] This boundary is attested in another Inscription No. 2104, of the same collection. Inscription No. 2103, seems to indicate Arcadian mercenaries in the service of Leukon: about the mercenaries, see Diodor. xx. 22.

Parisades I. is said to have been worshiped as a God, after his death (Strabo, vii. p. 310).

22,000 foot, the two allies marched to attack the territories of Satyrus, who advanced to meet them, with 2000 Grecian mercenaries, and 2000 Thracians of his own, reinforced by a numerous body of Scythian allies—20,000 foot, and 10,000 horse, and carrying with him a plentiful supply of provisions in waggons. He gained a complete victory, compelling Eumelus and Ariopharnes to retreat and seek refuge in the regal residence of the latter, near the river Thapsis; a fortress built of timber, and surrounded with forest, river, marsh, and rock, so as to be very difficult of approach. Satyrus, having first plundered the country around, which supplied a rich booty of prisoners and cattle, proceeded to assail his enemies in their almost impracticable position. But though he, and Meniskus his general of mercenaries, made the most strenuous efforts, and even carried some of the outworks, they were repulsed from the fortress itself; and Satyrus, exposing himself forwardly to extricate Meniskus, received a wound of which he shortly died—after a reign of nine months. Meniskus, raising the siege, withdrew the army to Gargaza; from whence he conveyed back the regal corpse to Pantikapæum[1].

[1] Diodor. xx. 24. The scene of these military operations (as far as we can pretend to make it out from the brief and superficial narrative of Diodorus), seems to have been on the European side of Bosporus; somewhere between the Borysthenes river and the Isthmus of Perekop, in the territory called by Herodotus *Hylæa*. This is Niebuhr's opinion, which I think more probable than that of Boeckh, who supposes the operations to have occurred on the Asiatic territory of Bosporus. So far I concur with Niebuhr; but his reasons for placing Dromichætes king of the Getæ (the victor over Lysimachus), east of the Borysthenes, are noway satisfactory.

Compare Niebuhr's Untersuchungen über die Skythen, &c. (in his

B.C. 309. Civil war between Prytanis and Eumelus—victory of Eumelus—he kills the wives, children, and friends of his brother.

Prytanis, the next brother, rejecting an offer of partition tendered by Eumelus, assumed the sceptre, and marched forth to continue the struggle. But the tide of fortune now turned in favour of Eumelus; who took Gargaza with several other places, worsted his brother in battle, and so blocked him up in the isthmus near the Palus Mæotis, that he was forced to capitulate and resign his pretensions. Eumelus entered Pantikapæum as conqueror. Nevertheless, the defeated Prytanis, in spite of his recent covenant, made a renewed attempt upon the crown; wherein he was again baffled, forced to escape to Kêpi, and there slain. To assure himself of the throne, Eumelus put to death the wives and children of both his two brothers, Satyrus and Prytanis—together with all their principal friends. One youth alone—Parisades, son of Satyrus—escaped and found protection with the Scythian prince Agarus.

His reign and conquests—his speedy death.

Eumelus had now put down all rivals; yet his recent cruelties had occasioned wrath and disgust among the Bosporanic citizens. He convoked them in assembly, to excuse his past conduct, and promised good government for the future; at the same time guaranteeing to them their full civic constitution, with such privileges and immunities

Kleine Schriften, p. 380), with Boeckh's Commentary on the Sarmatian Inscriptions, Corp. Ins. Græc. part xi. p. 83–103.

The mention by Diodorus of a wooden fortress, surrounded by morass and forest, is curious, and may be illustrated by the description in Herodotus (iv. 108) of the city of the Budini. This habit, of building towns and fortifications of wood, prevailed among the Slavonic population in Russia and Poland until far down in the middle ages. See Paul Joseph Schaffarik, Slavische Alterthümer, in the German translation of Wuttke, vol. i. ch. 10, p. 192; also K. Neumann, Die Hellenen im Skythenlande, p. 91.

as they had before enjoyed, and freedom from direct taxation[1]. Such assurances, combined probably with an imposing mercenary force, appeased or at least silenced the prevailing disaffection. Eumelus kept his promises so far as to govern in a mild and popular spirit. While thus rendering himself acceptable at home, he maintained an energetic foreign policy, and made several conquests among the surrounding tribes. He constituted himself a sort of protector of the Euxine, repressing the piracies of the Heniochi and Achæi (among the Caucasian mountains to the east) as well as of the Tauri in the Chersonesus (Crimea); much to the satisfaction of the Byzantines, Sinopians, and other Pontic Greeks. He received a portion of the fugitives from Kallatis, when besieged by Lysimachus, and provided for them a settlement in his dominions. Having thus acquired great reputation, Eumelus was in the full career of conquest and aggrandisement, when an accident terminated his life, after a reign of rather more than five years. In returning from Scythia to Pantikapæum, in a four-wheeled carriage (or waggon) and four with a tent upon it, his horses took fright and ran away. Perceiving that they were carrying him towards a precipice, he tried to jump out; but his sword becoming entangled in the wheel, he was killed on the spot[2]. He was succeeded by his son Spartokus IV., who reigned twenty years (304-284 B.C.); afterwards came the son of Spartokus, Parisades II.; with whose name our information breaks off[3].

[1] Diodor. xx. 24. [2] Diodor. xx. 25.

[3] Diodor. xx. 100. Spartokus IV.—son of Eumelus—is recognized in

Decline of the Bosporanic dynasty, until it passed into the hands of Mithridates.

This dynasty, the Spartokidæ, though they ruled the Greeks of Bosporus as despots by means of a foreign mercenary force—yet seem to have exercised power with equity and moderation[1]. Had Eumelus lived, he might probably have established an extensive empire over the barbaric tribes on all sides of him. But empire over such subjects was seldom permanent; nor did his successors long maintain even as much as he left. We have no means of following their fortunes in detail; but we know that about a century B.C., the then reigning prince, Parisades IV., found himself so pressed and squeezed by the Scythians[2], that he was forced (like Olbia and the Pentapolis) to forego his independence; and to call in, as auxiliary or master, the formidable Mithridates Eupator of Pontus; from whom a new dynasty of Bosporanic kings began—subject however, after no long interval, to the dominion and interference of Rome.

Monuments left by the Spartokid princes of Bosporus—sepulchral tumuli near Kertch (Pantikapæum).

These Mithridatic princes lie beyond our period; but the cities of Bosporus under the Spartokid princes, in the fourth century B.C., deserve to be ranked among the conspicuous features of the living Hellenic world. They were not indeed purely Hellenic, but presented a considerable admixture of Scythian or Oriental manners; analogous to the

one Attic Inscription (No. 107), and various Bosporanic (No. 2105, 2106, 2120) in Boeckh's Collection. Parisades II.—son of Spartokus—is recognized in another Bosporanic Inscription, No. 2107—seemingly also in No. 2120 *b*.

[1] Strabo, vii. p. 310. Deinarchus however calls Parisades, Satyrus, and Gorgippus, τοὺς ἐχθίστους τυράννους (adv. Demosth. s. 44).

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 310. οὐχ οἷός τε ὢν ἀντέχειν πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, φόρον πραττομένους μείζω τοῦ πρότερον, &c.

mixture of the Hellenic and Libyan elements at Kyrênê with its Battiad princes. Among the facts attesting the wealth and power of these Spartokid princes, and of the Bosporanic community, we may number the imposing groups of mighty sepulchral tumuli near Kertch (Pantikapæum); some of which have been recently examined, while the greater part still remain unopened. These spacious chambers of stone—enclosed in vast hillocks (Kurgans), cyclopian works piled up with prodigious labour and cost—have been found to contain not only a profusion of ornaments of the precious metals (gold, silver, and electron, or a mixture of four parts of gold to one of silver), but also numerous vases, implements, and works of art, illustrating the life and ideas of the Bosporanic population. "The contents of the tumuli already opened are so multifarious, that from the sepulchres of Pantikapæum alone, we might become acquainted with every thing which served the Greeks either for necessary use, or for the decoration of domestic life[1]." Statues, reliefs, and frescoes on the walls, have been found, on varied subjects both of war and peace, and often of very fine execution; besides these, numerous carvings in wood, and vessels of bronze or terra cotta; with necklaces, armlets, bracelets, rings, drinking cups, &c. of precious metal—several with coloured beads attached[2]. The costumes, equip-

[1] Neumann, Die Hellenen im Skythenlande, p. 503.

[2] An account of the recent discoveries near Kertch or Pantikapæum, will be found in Dubois de Montpéreux, Voyage dans le Caucase, vol. v. p. 135 *seqq.*; and in Neumann, Die Hellenen im Skythenlande, pp. 483–533. The last-mentioned work is peculiarly copious and instructive; relating what has been done since Dubois's travels, and containing

ment, and physiognomy represented, are indeed a mixture of Hellenic and barbaric; moreover, even the profusion of gold chains and other precious ornaments, indicates a tone of sentiment partially orientalized, in those for whom they were destined.

abundant information derived from the recent memoirs of the St. Petersburg Literary Societies.

The local and special type, which shows itself so much on these works of art, justifies the inference that they were not brought from other Grecian cities, but executed by Grecian artists resident at Pantikapæum (p. 507). Two marble statues, a man and a woman, both larger than life, exhumed in 1850, are spoken of with peculiar admiration (p. 491). Coins of the third and fourth century B.C. have been found in several (p. 494–495). A great number of the so-called Etruscan vases have also been discovered, probably fabricated from a species of clay still existing in the neighbourhood: the figures on these vases are often excellent, with designs and scenes of every description, religious, festal, warlike, domestic (p. 522). Many of the sarcophagi are richly ornamented with carvings, in wood, ivory, &c.; some admirably executed (p. 521).

Unfortunately, the belief prevails, and has long prevailed, among the neighbouring population, that these tumuli contain hidden treasures. One of the most striking among them—called the Kul-Obo—was opened in 1830 by the Russian authorities. After great pains and trouble, the means of entrance were discovered, and the interior chamber was reached. It was the richest that had ever been opened; being found to contain some splendid golden ornaments, as well as many other relics. The Russian officers placed a guard to prevent any one from entering it; but the cupidity of the population of Kertch was so inflamed by the report of the expected treasure being discovered, that they forced the guard, broke into the interior, and pillaged most of the contents (p. 509). The Russian authorities have been generally anxious for the preservation and gradual excavation of these monuments, but have had to contend against repugnance and even rapacity on the part of the people near.

Dubois de Montpéreux gives an interesting description of the opening of these tumuli near Kertch—especially of the Kul-Obo, the richest of all, which he conceives to have belonged to one of the Spartokid kings, and the decorations of which were the product of Hellenic art:—

"Si l'on a enterré (he observes) un roi entouré d'un luxe Scythique, ce sont des Grecs et des artistes de cette nation qui ont travaillé à ses funerailles" (Voyage autour du Caucase, pp. 195, 213, 227). Pantikapæum and Phanagoria (he says) "se reconnoissent de loin à la foule de leurs tumulus" (p. 137).

But the design as well as the execution comes clearly out of the Hellenic workshop; and there is good ground for believing, that in the fourth century B.C., Pantikapæum was the seat, not only of enterprising and wealthy citizens, but also of strenuous and well-directed artistic genius. Such manifestations of the refinements of Hellenism, in this remote and little-noticed city, form an important addition to the picture of Hellas as a whole,—prior to its days of subjection,—which it has been the purpose of this history to present.

I have now brought down the history of Greece to the point of time marked out in the Preface to my First Volume—the close of the generation contemporary with Alexander—the epoch, from whence dates not only the extinction of Grecian political freedom and self-action, but also the decay of productive genius, and the debasement of that consummate literary and rhetorical excellence which the fourth century B.C. had seen exhibited in Plato and Demosthenes[1]. The contents of this last Volume indicate but too clearly that Greece as a separate subject of history no

[1] How marked that degradation was, may be seen attested by Dionysius of Halikarnassus, De Antiquis Oratoribus, pp. 445, 446, Reiske—ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν χρόνοις ἡ μὲν ἀρχαία καὶ φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ προπηλακιζομένη καὶ δεινὰς ὕβρεις ὑπομένουσα κατελύετο, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος τελευτῆς ἐκπνεῖν καὶ μαραίνεσθαι κατ' ὀλιγον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας μικροῦ δεήσασα εἰς τέλος ἠφανίσθαι. Compare Dionys. De Composit. Verbor. p. 29, 30, Reisk.; and Westermann, Geschichte der Griechischen Beredtsamkeit, s. 75-77.

longer exists; for one full half of it is employed in depicting Alexander and his conquests — ἄγριον αἰχμητὴν, κρατερὸν μήστωρα φόβοιο[1]—that Non-Hellenic conqueror into whose vast possessions the Greeks are absorbed, with their intellectual brightness bedimmed, their spirit broken, and half their virtue taken away by Zeus—the melancholy emasculation inflicted (according to Homer) upon victims overtaken by the day of slavery[2].

One branch of intellectual energy there was, and one alone, which continued to flourish, comparatively little impaired, under the preponderance of the Macedonian sword—the spirit of speculation and philosophy. During the century which we have just gone through, this spirit was embodied in several eminent persons, whose names have been scarcely adverted to in this history. Among these names, indeed, there are two, of peculiar grandeur, whom I have brought partially before the reader, because both of them belong to general history as well as to philosophy; Plato, as citizen of Athens, companion of Sokrates at his trial, and counsellor of Dionysius in his glory—Aristotle, as the teacher of Alexander. I had at one time hoped to include in my present work a record of them as philosophers also, and an estimate of their speculative characteristics; but I find the subject far too vast to be compressed into such a space as this volume would afford. The exposition of the tenets of distinguished

[1] Hom. Iliad, vi. 97.

[2] Hom. Odyss. xvii. 322.—

ἤμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνυται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἀνέρος, εὖτ' ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἕλῃσιν.

thinkers is not now numbered by historians, either ancient or modern, among the duties incumbent upon them, nor yet among the natural expectations of their readers; but is reserved for the special historian of philosophy. Accordingly, I have brought my history of Greece to a close, without attempting to do justice either to Plato or to Aristotle. I hope to contribute something towards supplying this defect, the magnitude of which I fully appreciate, in a separate work, devoted specially to an account of Greek speculative philosophy in the fourth century B.C.

APPENDIX.

ON ISSUS

AND ITS NEIGHBOURHOOD, AS CONNECTED WITH THE BATTLE.

THE exact battle-field of Issus cannot be certainly assigned, upon the evidence accessible to us. But it may be determined, within a few miles north or south; and what is even more important — the general features of the locality, as well as the preliminary movements of the contending armies, admit of being clearly conceived and represented. The annexed Plan, of the country round the Gulf of Issus, will enable the reader to follow easily what is certain, and to understand the debate about what is matter of hypothesis.

That the battle was fought in some portion of the narrow space intervening between the eastern coast of the Gulf of Issus and the western flank of Mount Amanus—that Alexander's left and Darius's right, rested on the sea, and their right and left respectively on the mountain—that Darius came upon Alexander unexpectedly from the rear, thus causing him to return back a day's march from Myriandrus, and to reoccupy a pass which he had already passed through and quitted—these points are clearly given, and appear to me not open to question. We know that the river Pinarus, on which the battle was fought, was at a certain distance *south* of Issus, the last town of Kilikia before entering Syria (Arrian, ii. 7, 2)—ἐς τὴν ὑστεραίαν προυχώρει (Darius from Issus) ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν Πίναρον—Ritter erroneously states that Issus was *upon* the river Pinarus, which he even calls *the Issus river* (Erdkunde, Theil iv. Abth. 2. p. 1797–1806). We know also that this river was at some distance *north* of the maritime pass called the Gates of Kilikia and Assyria, through which Alexander passed and repassed.

But when we proceed, beyond these data (the last of them only vague and relative), to fix the exact battle-field, we are reduced to conjecture. Dr. Thirlwall, in an appendix to the sixth volume of his history, has collected and discussed very ably the different opinions of various geographers.

To those whom he has cited, may be added—Mr. Ainsworth's Essay on the Cilician and Syrian Gates (in the Transactions of the Geographical Society for 1837)—Mützel's Topographical Notes on the third book of Quintus Curtius—and the last volume of Ritter's Erdkunde, published only this year (1855), ch. xxvii. p. 1778 *seqq.*

We know from Xenophon that Issus was a considerable town close to the sea—two days' march from the river Pyramus, and one day's march northward of the maritime pass called the Gates of Kilikia and Syria. That it was near the north-eastern corner of the Gulf, may also be collected from Strabo, who reckons the shortest line across Asia Minor, as stretching from Sinôpê or Amisus *to Issus*—and who also lays down the Egyptian sea as having its northern termination *at Issus* (Strabo, xiv. p. 677; xvi. p. 749). The probable site of Issus has been differently determined by different authors; Rennell (Illustrations of the Geography of the Anabasis, p. 42–48) places it near Oseler or Yusler; as far as I can judge, this seems too far distant from the head of the Gulf, towards the south.

In respect to the maritime pass, called the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, there is much discrepancy between Xenophon and Arrian. It is evident that, in Xenophon's time, this pass and the road of march through it lay between the mountains and the sea, —and that the obstructions (walls blocking up the passage), which he calls insurmountable by force, were mainly of artificial creation. But when Alexander passed no walls existed. The artificial obstructions had disappeared during the seventy years between Xenophon and Alexander; and we can assign a probable reason why. In Xenophon's time, Kilikia was occupied by the native prince Syennesis, who, though tributary, maintained a certain degree of independence even in regard to the Great King, and therefore kept a wall guarded by his own soldiers on his boundary towards Syria. But in Alexander's time, Kilikia was occupied, like Syria, by a Persian satrap. Artificial boundary walls, between two conterminous satrapies under the same master, were unnecessary; and must even have been found inconvenient, during the great collective military operations of the Persian satraps against the revolted Evagoras of Cyprus (principally carried on from Kilikia as a base, about 380 B.C., Diodor. xv. 2)—as well as in the subsequent operations against the Phenician towns (Diodor. xvi. 42). Hence we may discern a reason why all artificial

obstructions may have been swept away before the time of Alexander; leaving only the natural difficulties of the neighbouring ground, upon which Xenophon has not touched.

The spot still retained its old name—"The Gates of Kilikia and Syria"—even after walls and gates had been dispensed with. But that name, in Arrian's description, designates a difficult and narrow point of the road *over hills and rocks*; a point which Major Rennell (Illustrations, p. 54) supposes to have been about a mile south of the river and walls described by Xenophon. However this may be, the precise spot designated by Xenophon seems probably to be sought about seven miles north of Scanderoon, near the ruins now known as Jonas's Pillars (or Sakal Tutan), and the Castle of Merkes, where a river called *Merkes*, *Mahersy*, or *Kara-su*, flows across from the mountain to the sea. That this river is the same with the Kersus of Xenophon, is the opinion of Rennell, Ainsworth, and Mützel; as well as of Colonel Callier, who surveyed the country when accompanying the army of Ibrahim Pacha as engineer (cited by Ritter, Erdk. p. 1792). At the spot here mentioned, the gulf indents eastward, while the western flank of Amanus approaches very close to it, and drops with unusual steepness towards it. Hence the road now followed does not pass between the mountain and the sea, but ascends over a portion of the mountain, and descends again afterwards to the low ground skirting the sea. Northward of Merkes, the space between the mountain and the sea gradually widens, towards Bayas. At some distance to the north of Bayas occurs the river now called Delle Tschai, which is considered, I think with probability, to be the Pinarus, where the battle between Alexander and Darius was fought. This opinion however is not unanimous; Kinneir identifies the *Merkes* with the Pinarus. Moreover, there are several different streams which cross the space between Mount Amanus and the sea. Des Monceaux notices six streams as having been crossed between the Castle of Merkes and Bayas; and five more streams between Bayas and Ayas (Mützel ad Curtium, p. 105). Which among these is the Pinarus, cannot be settled without more or less of doubt.

Besides the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, noted by Xenophon and Arrian in the above passages, there are also other Gates called *the Amanian Gates*, which are spoken of in a perplexing manner. Dr. Thirlwall insists with propriety on the necessity of distinguishing the *maritime* passes, between Mount Amanus and the

sea—from the *inland* passes, which crossed over the ridge of Mount Amanus itself. But this distinction seems not uniformly observed by ancient authors, when we compare Strabo, Arrian, and Kallisthenes. Strabo uses the phrase, *Amanian Gates*, twice (xiv. p. 676; xvi. p. 751); in both cases designating a *maritime pass*, and not a pass *over* the mountain,—yet designating one maritime pass in the page first referred to, and another in the second. In xiv. p. 676—he means by αἱ Ἀμανίδες πύλαι, the spot called by modern travellers Demir Kapu, between Ægæ and Issus, or between Mopsuestia and Issus; while in xvi. 751—he means by the same words that which I have been explaining as the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, on the eastern side of the Gulf of Issus. In fact, Strabo seems to conceive as a whole the strip of land between Mount Amanus and the Gulf, beginning at Demir Kapu, and ending at the Gates of Kilikia and Syria—and to call both the beginning and the end of it by the same name—the Amanian Gates. But he does not use this last phrase to designate the passage over or across Mount Amanus; neither does Arrian; who in describing the march of Darius from Sochi into Kilikia, says (ii. 7, 1)—ὑπερβαλὼν δὴ τὸ ὄρος Δαρεῖος τὸ κατὰ τὰς πύλας τὰς Ἀμανικὰς καλουμένας, ὡς ἐπὶ Ἴσσον προῆγε, καὶ ἐγένετο κατόπιν Ἀλεξάνδρου λαθών. Here, let it be observed, we do not read ὑπερβαλὼν τὰς πύλας—nor can I think that the words mean, as the translator gives them—"transiit Amanum, *eundo per Pylas Amanicas.*" The words rather signify, that Darius "crossed over the mountain where it adjoined the Amanian Gates"—*i. e.* where it adjoined the strip of land skirting the Gulf, and lying between those two extreme points which Strabo denominates *Amanian Gates.* Arrian employs this last phrase more loosely than Strabo, yet still with reference to the maritime strip, and not to a *col* over the mountain ridge.

On the other hand, Kallisthenes (if he is rightly represented by Polybius, who recites his statement, not his words, xii. 17) uses the words *Amanian Gates* to signify the passage by which Darius entered Kilikia—that is, the passage *over* the mountain. That which Xenophon and Arrian call the *Gates of Kilikia and Syria* —and which Strabo calls *Amanian Gates*—is described by Polybius as τὰ στενὰ, καὶ τὰς λεγομένας ἐν τῇ Κιλικίᾳ πύλας.

I have marked on the Plan the pass by which Darius crossed Mount Amanus, as it stands on Kiepert's Map, and on Chesney's Map; in the line from Aintab to the head of the Gulf, near the

37th parallel. It seems pretty certain that this must have been Darius's line of march, because he came down immediately upon Issus, and then marched forward to the river Pinarus. Had he entered Kilikia by the pass of Beylan, he must have passed the Pinarus *before* he reached Issus. The positive grounds for admitting a practicable pass near the 37th parallel, are indeed called in question by Mützel (ad Curtium, p. 102, 103), and are not in themselves conclusive; still I hold them sufficient, when taken in conjunction with the probabilities of the case. This pass was, however, we may suppose, less frequented than the maritime line of road through the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, and the pass of Beylan; which, as the more usual, was preferred both by the Cyreians and by Alexander.

Respecting the march of Alexander, Dr. Thirlwall here starts a question, substantially to this effect: "Since Alexander intended to march through the pass of Beylan for the purpose of attacking the Persian camp at Sochi, what could have caused him to go to Myriandrus, which was more south than Beylan, and out of his road?" Dr. Thirlwall feels this difficulty so forcibly, that in order to eliminate it, he is inclined to accept the hypothesis of Mr. Williams, which places Myriandrus at Bayas, and the Kiliko-Syrian Gates at Demir-Kapu; an hypothesis which appears to me inadmissible on various grounds, and against which Mr. Ainsworth (in his Essay on the Cilician and Syrian Gates) has produced several very forcible objections.

I confess that I do not feel the difficulty on which Dr. Thirlwall insists. When we see that Cyrus and the Ten Thousand went to Myriandrus, in their way to the Pass of Beylan, we may reasonably infer that, whether that town was in the direct line or not, it was at least in the *usual* road of march—which does not always coincide with the direct line. But to waive this supposition, however—let us assume that there existed another shorter road leading to Beylan without passing by Myriandrus—there would still be reason enough to induce Alexander to go somewhat out of his way, in order to visit Myriandrus. For it was an important object with him to secure the sea-ports in his rear, in case of a possible reverse. Suppose him repulsed and forced to retreat,—it would be a material assistance to his retreat, to have assured himself beforehand of Myriandrus as well as the other sea-ports. In the approaching months, we shall find him just as careful to make sure of the Phenician cities on the coast, before he marches into the interior to attack Darius at Arbela.

Farther, Alexander, marching to attack Darius, had nothing to gain by haste, and nothing to lose by coming up to Sochi three days later. He knew that the enormous Persian host would not try to escape; it would either await him at Sochi, or else advance into Kilikia to attack him there. The longer he tarried, the more likely they were to do the latter, which was what he desired. He had nothing to lose therefore in any way, and some chance of gain, by prolonging his march to Sochi for as long a time as was necessary to secure Myriandrus. There is no more difficulty, I think, in understanding why he went to Myriandrus, than why he went westward from Tarsus (still more out of his line of advance) to Soli and Anchialus.

It seems probable (as Rennell (p. 56) and others think), that the site of Myriandrus is now some distance inland; that there has been an accretion of new land and morass on the coast.

The modern town of Scanderoon occupies the site of Ἀλεξανδρεια κατ' Ἰσσον, founded (probably by order of Alexander himself) in commemoration of the victory of Issus. According to Ritter (p. 1791), "Alexander had the great idea of establishing there an emporium for the traffic of the East with Europe, as at the other Alexandria for the trade of the East with Egypt." The importance of the site of Scanderoon, in antiquity, is here greatly exaggerated. I know no proof that Alexander had the idea which Ritter ascribes to him; and it is certain that his successors had no such idea; because they founded the great cities of Antioch and Seleukeia (in Pieria), both of them carrying the course of trade up the Orontes, and therefore diverting it away from Scanderoon. This latter town is only of importance as being the harbour of Aleppo; a city (Berœa) of little consequence in antiquity, while Antioch became the first city in the East, and Seleukeia among the first: see Ritter, p. 1152.

THE END.

INDEX.

ABANTES.

Abantes, iii. 222.
Abdêra, the army of Xerxes at, v. 58.
Abrokomas, ix. 36, 42.
Abydos, march of Xerxes to, v. 40; revolt of, from Athens, viii. 127; Athenian victory at, over the Peloponnesians, viii. 157; Athenian victory over Pharnabazus at, viii. 176; Derkyllidas at, ix. 443 *seq.*; Anaxibius and Iphikrates at, ix. 511 *seq.*
Achæan origin affected by Spartan kings, ii. 15; league, xii. 527.
Achæans, various accounts of, i. 143, 144; effect of the Dorian occupation of Peloponnesus on, ii. 16; Homeric view of, ii. 17; of Phthiôtis and Peloponnesus, ii. 380; of Peloponnesus, ii. 407, 451.
Achæmenes, v. 132.
Achæus, i. 143, 275.
Achaia, ii. 404; towns and territory of, ii. 626 *seq.*; Epaminondas in, B.C. 367, x. 365; proceedings of the Thebans in, B.C. 367, x. 367; alliance of, with Sparta and Elis, B.C. 365, x. 429.
Acharnæ, Archidamus at, vi. 177 *seq.*
Achelôus, i. 383.
Achillêis, the basis of the Iliad, ii. 236 *seq.*
Achillês, i. 396 *seq.*, 404 *seq.*
Achradina, capture of, by Neon, xi. 221.
Acropolis at Athens, flight to, on Xerxes's approach, v. 150; capture of, by Xerxes, v. 158 *seq.*; visit of the Peisistratids to, after its capture by Xerxes, v. 161; inviolable reserve fund in, vi. 187 *seq.*
Ada, queen of Karia, xii. 127, 133.
Adeimantus, of Corinth, and Themistoklês, at Salamis, v. 168, 170.
Admêtus and Alkêstis, i. 155 *seq.*
Admêtus and Themistoklês, v. 384.
Adranum, Timoleon at, xi. 209, 220.
Adrastus, i. 369, 372 *seq.*, 379; iii. 46.
Adrastus, the Phrygian exile, iii. 205.
Adrumetum, captured by Agathokles, xii. 567.
Æa, i. 340 *seq.*
Æakid genealogy, i. 252 *seq.*, 260.
Æakus, i. 252 *seq.*
Æêtês, i. 164; and the Argonauts, i. 323 *seq.*; and Circê, i. 342.
Ægæ, iii. 258.
Ægean, islands in, ii. 312; the Macedonian fleet master of, xii. 192.
Ægean islands, effect of the battle of Chæroneia on, xi. 696.
Ægeids at Sparta, ii. 486.
Ægeus, i. 281; death of, i. 304.
Ægialeus, i. 113.

ÆSCHINES.

Ægina, i. 252; war of, against Athens, at the instigation of the Thebans, iv. 230, 232, 427; submission of, to Darius, iv. 426; appeal of Athenians to Sparta against the Medism of, iv. 429; attempted revolution at, by Nikodromus, v. 65 *seq.*; from B.C. 488 to 481, v. 65, 67 *seq.*, 73; and Athens, settlement of the feud between, v. 80; removal of Athenians to, on Xerxes's approach, v. 149; Greek fleet at, in the spring of B.C. 479, v. 200; war of Athens against, B.C. 459, v. 438; subdued by Athens, v. 450; expulsion of the Æginetans from, by the Athenians, vi. 184; and Athens, B.C. 389, ix. 516 *seq.*; Gorgôpas in, ix. 518 *seq.*; Teleutias in, ix. 517, 521.
Æginæan scale, ii. 428 *seq.*, 436; iii. 230.
Æginetans, and Thebans, i. 252; and the hostages taken from them by Kleomenês and Leotychidês, v. 63 *seq.*; pre-eminence of, at Salamis, v. 196; at Thyrea, capture and death of, B.C. 424, vi. 498.
Ægistheus, i. 221 *seq.*
Ægospotami, battle of, viii. 295 *seq.*; condition of Athens and her dependencies after the battle of, viii. 301, 304, 307 *seq.*
Ægyptos, i. 120.
Æimnestus and Dionysius, x. 650.
Æneadæ at Skêpsis, i. 428.
Æneas, i. 413, 427 *seq.*
Ænianes, ii. 383.
Æolic Greeks in the Trôad, i. 453; emigration under the Pelopids, ii, 27; Kymê, custom at, in cases of murder, ii. 127 *n.*; and Doric dialects, ii. 452; cities in Asia, iii. 257 *seq.*; emigration, iii. 259, 263; establishments near Mount Ida, iii. 263.
Æolid line, the first, i. 147 *seq.*; the second, i. 155 *seq.*; the third, i. 163 *seq.*; the fourth, i. 168 *seq.*
Æolis, iii. 263, 264; the subsatrapy of, and Pharnabazus, ix. 291 *seq.*
Æolus, i. 136 *seq.*, 147.
Æpytus, i. 242.
Æschinês, at the battle of Tamynæ, xi. 477; proceedings of, against Philip, after his capture of Olynthus, xi. 508; early history of, xi. 509; as envoy of Athens in Arcadia, xi. 510; desire of, for peace, B.C. 347, xi. 511; and the embassies from Athens to Philip, xi. 529 *seq.*, 561, 568, 571 *seq.*, 583; and the motion of Philokrates for peace and alliance with Philip, xi. 542 *seq.*; fabrications of, about Philip, xi.

551, 565, 566, 570 *seq.*; visit of, to Philip in Phokis, xi. 585; justifies Philip after his conquest of Thermopylæ, xi. 587; corruption of, xi. 594 *seq.*; at the Amphiktyonic assembly at Delphi, B.C. 359, xi. 650 *seq.*; on the special Amphiktyonic meeting at Thermopylæ, xi. 663; conduct of, after the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 698; accusation against Ktesiphon by, xii. 385 *seq.*; exile of, xii. 394 *seq.*

Æschylus, Promêtheus ôf, i. 107, 516 *n.*; his Eumenides and the Areopagus, iii. 108 *n.*; his treatment of mythes, i. 511 *seq.*; Sophoklês, and Euripidês, viii. 441 *seq.*

Æsculapius, i. 246 *seq.*

Æsôn, death of, i. 158.

Æsymnète, iii. 26.

Æthiopis of Arktinus, ii. 209.

Æthlius, i. 137.

Ætna, foundation of the city of, v. 309; second city of, v. 320; reconquered by Duketius, vii. 168; conquest of, by Dionysius, x. 650; Campanians of, x. 693.

Ætolia, legendary settlement of, i. 189; expedition of Demosthenês against, vi. 401 *seq.*

Ætolian genealogy, i. 193.

Ætolians, ii. 388; rude condition of, ii. 392; immigration of, into Peloponnesus, ii. 438 *seq.*; and Akarnanians, iii. 554; and Peloponnesians under Eurylochus attack Naupaktus, xi. 407; contest and pacification of, with Antipater, xii. 447; Kassander's attempts to check, xii. 499.

Ætolo-Eleians and the Olympic games, ii. 427.

Ætôlus, i. 140, 142; and Oxylus, i. 209.

Africa, circumnavigation of, by the Phenicians, iii. 381 *seq.*; expedition of Agathoklês to, against Carthage, xii. 554 *seq.*, 601.

Agamêdês and Trophonius, i. 177.

Agamemnôn, pre-eminence of, i. 211 *seq.*, 221 *seq.*, 224; and Orestes transferred to Sparta, i. 229; and the Trojan expedition, i. 392, 398.

Agaristê and Megaklês, iii. 52.

Agasias, ix. 205, 207 *seq.*

Agathokles, first rise of, xii. 536; distinction of, in the Syracusan expedition to Kroton, xii. 537; retires from Syracuse to Italy, xii. 538; exploits of, in Italy and Sicily, about B.C. 320, xii. 538; first ascendency of, at Syracuse, xii. 539; his readmission to Syracuse, xii. 540; massacres the Syracusans, xii. 541 *seq.*; constituted despot of Syracuse, xii. 543; his popular manners, and military success, xii. 544 *seq.*; and the Agrigentines, xii. 546, 548, 549; and Deinokrates, xii. 550, 595, 603 *seq.*; massacre at Gela by, xii. 551; defeat of, at the Himera, xii. 552, 553; expedition of, to Africa, xii. 554 *seq.*, 601; capture of Megalêpolis and Tunês by, xii. 560; victory of, over Hanno and Bomilkar, xii. 562 *seq.*; operations of, on the eastern coast of Carthage, xii. 567 *seq.*; mutiny in the army of, at Tunês, xii. 575; in Numidia, xii. 577; and Ophellas, xii. 577, 583 *seq.*; capture of Utica by, xii. 590; goes from Africa to Sicily, B.C. 306–305, xii. 592, 594; in Sicily, B.C. 306–305, xii. 594 *seq.*; returns from Sicily to Africa, where he is defeated by the Carthaginians, xii. 597; deserts his army at Tunês, and they capitulate, xii. 599, 600; barbarities of, at Egesta and Syracuse, after his African expedition, xii. 602; operations of, in Liparæ, Italy, and Korkyra, xii. 606; last projects and death of, xii. 607 *seq.*; genius and character of, xii. 609 *seq.*

Agavê and Pentheus, i. 355 *seq.*

Agêma, Macedonian, xii. 86.

Agên, the satyric drama, xii. 398, 399 *n.* 1.

Agenôr and his offspring, i. 350.

Agesandridas, viii. 91, 96 *seq.*

Agesilaus, character of, ix. 336, 342, 387; nomination of, as king, ix. 338 *seq.*; popular conduct and partisanship of, ix. 341; expedition of, to Asia, B.C. 397, ix. 355 *seq.*; humiliation of Lysander by, ix. 359 *seq.*; Tissaphernes breaks the truce with, ix. 362; attacks of, on the satrapy of Pharnabazus, ix. 363, 380 *seq.*; his enrichment of his friends, ix. 364; humanity of, ix. 365; naked exposure of Asiatic prisoners by, ix. 367 *seq.*; at Ephesus, ix. 369; victory of, near Sardis, ix. 370; negotiations of, with Tithraustes, ix. 373; appointed to command at sea and on land, ix. 374, 376; efforts of, to augment his fleet, ix. 380; and Spithridates, ix. 381; and Pharnabazus, conference between, ix. 384 *seq.*; large preparations and recall of, from Asia, ix. 388, 422, 429 *seq.*; relations of Sparta with her neighbours and allies after the accession of, ix. 395; on the northern frontier of Bœotia, ix. 433; victory of, at Koroneia, ix. 435 *seq.*; and Teleutias, capture of the Long Walls at Corinth, and of Lechæum by, ix. 470 *seq.*; capture of Peiræum and Œnoê by, ix. 476, 478 *seq.*; and the Isthmian festival, ix. 477; and the envoys from Thebes, ix. 481, 489; and the destruction of the Lacedæmonian *mora* by Iphikrates, ix. 482, 488; expedition of, against Akarnania, ix. 491; and the peace of Antalkidas, ix. 535 *seq.*; miso-Theban sentiment of, x. 37, 45; his defence of Phœbidas, x. 84; subjugation of Phlius by, x. 95 *seq.*; and the trial of Sphodrias, x. 136; expeditions of, against Thebes, x. 171 *seq.*; and Epaminondas, at the congress at Sparta, B.C. 371, x. 230; and the re-establishment of Mantinea, x. 279 *seq.*; feeling against, at Sparta, B.C. 371, x. 282; march of, against Mantinea, x. 287 *seq.*; vigilant defence of Sparta by, against Epaminondas, x. 302, 453; in Asia, B.C. 366, x. 402, 405; in Egypt, x. 498 *seq.*; and the independence of Mêssêne, x. 495; death and character of, x. 500 *seq.*

Agesipolis, ix. 493 *seq.*; x. 47 *seq.*, 91, 95.

Agētus and Aristō, iv. 440.
Agis II., invasion of Attica by, B.C. 435, vi. 424; advance of, to Leuktra, B.C. 419, vii. 88; invasion of Argos by, vii. 96 *seq.*; retirement of, from Argos, vii. 99 *seq.*; at the battle of Mantinea, B.C. 418, vii. 106 *seq.*; invasion of Attica by, vii. 395, 487; movements of, after the Athenian disaster in Sicily, vii. 501; applications from Eubœa and Lesbos to, B.C. 413, vii. 502; overtures of peace from the Four Hundred to, viii. 60; repulse of, by Thrasyllus, viii. 173; fruitless attempt of, to surprise Athens, viii. 205; invasions of Elis by, ix. 312 *seq.*; death of, ix. 335.
Agis III., ii. 538 *seq.*; xii. 172, 378 *seq.*
Aglaurion, v. 160 *n.*
Agnonides, xii. 473.
Agones and festivals in honour of gods, i. 70.
Agora, Homeric, ii. 91 *seq.*; and Boulē, ii. 104.
Agoratus, viii. 320, 327.
Agrigentine generals, accusation and death of, x. 591.
Agrigentines, and Agathokles, xii. 546, 548, 574; defeat of, by Leptines and Demophilus, xii. 594; defeat of, by Leptines, xii. 597.
Agrigentum, iii. 490; Phalaris of, iv. 511, v. 276; and Syracuse, before, B.C. 500, v. 276; prisoners sent to, after the battle of Himera, v. 304; and Syracuse, B.C. 446, vii. 171; after the Theronian dynasty, vii. 173, 174; and Hannibal's capture of Selinus, x. 564; defensive preparations at, against Hannibal and Imilkon, x. 584; strength, wealth, and population of, B.C. 406, x. 585 *seq.*; blockade and capture of, by the Carthaginians, x. 588 *seq.*; complaints against the Syracusan generals at, x. 591, 597, 600 *seq.*; declaration of, against Dionysius, xi. 8; Timoleon and the fresh colonization of, xi. 264; siege of, by Agathokles, xii. 549.
Agylla, plunder of the temple at, xi. 34.
Agyrium, Dionysius and Magon at, xi. 10.
Agyrrhius, ix. 511.
Ajax, son of Telamōn, i. 259, 407.
Ajax, son of Oïleus, i. 261, 413, 420.
Akanthus, iv. 33; march of Xerxes to, v. 59; induced by Brasidas to revolt from Athens, vi. 546 *seq.*; speech of Brasidas at, ix. 266 *seq.*; opposition of, to the Olynthian confederacy, x. 71 *seq.*, 78.
Akarnan and Amphoterus, i. 384.
Akarnania, Demosthenēs in, B.C. 426, vi. 401; expedition of Agesilaus against, ix. 491.
Akarnanians, ii. 391 *seq.*, iii. 552 *seq.*; and Athens, alliance between, vi. 163; under Demosthenēs save Naupaktus, vi. 408; and Amphilochians, pacific treaty of, with the Ambrakiots, vi. 421.
Akastus, wife of, and Pēleus, i. 157.
Akesines, crossed by Alexander, xii. 309.
Akræ in Sicily, iii. 490.
Akragas, iii. 491.
Akrisius, Danaē and Perseus, i. 123 *seq.*
Akrolatus, xii. 546.
Aktæōn, i. 354.
Aktē, Brasidas in, vi. 575.
Akusilaus, his treatment of mythes, i. 525.
Alæsa, foundation of, x. 552.
Alalia, Phokæan colony at, iv. 276.
Alazones, iii. 323.
Alcyone and Kēyx, i. 185.
Alēlēs, ii. 12.
Aleus, i. 242.
Alexander of Macedon, and Greeks at Tempē, on Xerxes's invasion, v. 94; embassy of, to Athens, v. 204 *seq.*; and the Athenians before the battle of Platæa, v. 231.
Alexander the Great, his visit to Ilium, i. 440, xii. 93; successors of, and Ilium, i. 441; comparison between the invasion of, and that of Xerxes, v. 326; birth of, xi. 338; at the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 690; quarrels of, with his father, xi. 708, xii. 5; accession of, xi. 714, xii. 1, 9; character, education, and early political action of, xii. 3 *seq.*; uncertain position of, during the last year of Philip, xii. 6; Amyntas put to death by, xii. 10; march of, into Greece, B.C. 336, xii. 15; chosen Imperator of the Greeks, xii. 17; convention at Corinth under, B.C. 336, xii. 17; authority claimed by, under the convention at Corinth, xii. 20; violations of the convention at Corinth by, xii. 21 *seq.*; expedition of, into Thrace, xii. 29 *seq.*, 33 *n.* 2; embassy of Gauls to, xii. 35; victories of, over Kleitus and the Illyrians, xii. 36 *seq.*; revolt of Thebes against, xii. 39 *seq.*; march of, from Thrace to Thebes, xii. 48; capture and destruction of Thebes by, xii. 50 *seq.*; demands the surrender of anti-Macedonian leaders at Athens, xii. 59; at Corinth, B.C. 335, xii. 64; and Diogenes, xii. 64; reconstitution of Bœotia by, xii. 65; Grecian history a blank in the reign of, xii. 67; connexion of his Asiatic conquests with Grecian history, xii. 68, 242 *seq.*; Pan-Hellenic pretences of, xii. 69; analogy of his relation to the Greeks with those of Napoleon to the Confederation of the Rhine, xii. 69, 70 *n.*; military endowments of, xii. 71; military changes in Greece during the sixty years before the accession of, xii. 72 *seq.*; measures of, before going to Asia, xii. 90; his march to the Hellespont and passage to Asia, xii. 93, 104; analogy of, to the Greek heroes, xii. 95; review of his army in Asia, xii. 96; Macedonian officers of his army in Asia, xii. 98; Greeks in his service in Asia, xii. 99; defensive preparations of Darius against, xii. 102; victory of, at the Granikus, xii. 108 *seq.*; submission of the Asiatics to, after the battle of the Granikus, xii. 119; and Mithrines, xii. 120, 280; capture of Ephesus by, xii. 121; capture of Miletus by, xii. 123 *seq.*; debate of,

with Parmenio at Miletus, xii. 124; disbands his fleet, xii. 126; capture of Halikarnassus by, xii. 127 *seq.*; conquest of Lykia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia by, xii. 134; at Kelænæ, xii. 136; cuts the Gordian knot, xii. 140; refuses to liberate the Athenians captured at the Granikus, xii. 141; subjugation of Paphlagonia and Kappadokia by, xii. 149; passes Mount Taurus and enters Tarsus, xii. 150 *seq.*; operations of, in Kilikia, xii. 153; march of, from Kilikia to Myriandrus, xii. 154; return of, from Myriandrus, xii. 159; victory of, at Issus, xii. 159 *seq.*; his courteous treatment of Darius's mother, wife and family, xii. 167, 208; his treatment of Greeks taken at Damascus, xii. 174; in Phœnicia, xii. 175 *seq.*, 203; his correspondence with Darius, xii. 176, 190; siege and capture of Tyre by, xii. 179 *seq.*; surrender of the princes of Cyprus to, xii. 186; his march towards Egypt, xii. 191, 193, 197; siege and capture of Gaza by, xii. 193 *seq.*; his cruelty to Batis, xii. 196; in Egypt, xii. 198 *seq.*; crosses the Euphrates at Thapsakus, xii. 204; fords the Tigris, xii. 205; continence of, xii. 208 *n.*; victory of, at Arbela, xii. 210 *seq.*; surrender of Susa and Babylon to, xii. 228; his march from Susa to Persepolis, xii. 231 *seq.*; at Persepolis, xii. 234 *seq.*; subjugation of Persis by, xii. 240; at Ekbatana, xii. 245, 331 *seq.*; sends home the Thessalian cavalry, xii. 246; pursues Darius into Parthia, xii. 247 *seq.*; disappointment of, in not taking Darius alive, xii. 252; Asiatizing tendencies of, xii. 254, 290, 359; at Hekatompylus, xii. 254; in Hyrkania, xii. 255; his treatment of the Grecian mercenaries and envoys with Darius, xii. 255, 256; in Aria and Drangiana, xii. 257 *seq.*, 270; Parmenio and Philotas put to death by, xii. 258 *seq.*; in Gedrosia, xii. 270, 317; foundation of Alexandria ad Caucasum by, xii. 271; in Baktria and Sogdiana, xii. 272 *seq.*; and Bessus, xii. 273, 279; massacre of the Branchidæ by, xii. 274 *seq.*; at Marakanda, xii. 276, 280 *seq.*; and the Scythians, xii. 278, 288; Kleitus killed by, xii. 281 *seq.*, 288, 291 *seq.*, 300 *seq.*; capture of the Sogdian rock and the rock of Choriênes by, xii. 289; and Roxana, xii. 289, 290; and Kallisthenes, conspiracy of royal pages against, xii. 298; reduces the country between Hindoo Koosh and the Indus, xii. 303 *seq.*; crosses the Indus and the Hydaspes, and defeats Porus, xii. 306 *seq.*, 308 *n.* 1 & 2; conquests of, in the Punjab, xii. 306 *seq.*; refusal of his army to march farther, xii. 311; voyage of, down the Hydaspes and the Indus, xii. 314; wounded in attacking the Malli, xii. 315; posts on the Indus established by, xii. 316; his bacchanalian procession through Karmania, xii. 318; and the tomb of Cyrus the Great, xii. 319; satraps of, xii. 321 *seq.*; discontents and mutiny of his Macedonian soldiers, xii. 324 *seq.*; Asiatic levies of, xii. 326; sails down the Pasitigris and up the Tigris to Opis, xii. 326; partial disbanding of his Macedonian soldiers by, xii. 329; preparations of, for the conquest and circumnavigation of Asia, xii. 330, 336; his grief for the death of Hephæstion, xii. 332, 341; extermination of the Kossæi by, xii. 334; his last visit to Babylon, xii. 334 *seq.*; numerous embassies to, B.C. 323, xii. 334; his sail on the Euphrates, xii. 337; his incorporation of Persians in the Macedonian phalanx, xii. 338; his despatch to Kleomenes, xii. 340; forebodings and suspicion of, at Babylon, xii. 341, 342 *n.* 2; illness and death of, xii. 342 *seq.*; rumoured poisoning of, xii. 345 *n.*; sentiments excited by the career and death of, xii. 346 *seq.*; probable achievements of, if he had lived longer, xii. 349 *seq.*; character of, as a ruler, xii. 352 *seq.*; absence of nationality in, xii. 355; Livy's opinion as to his chances, if he had attacked the Romans, xii. 350; unrivalled excellence of, as a military man, xii. 351; not the intentional diffuser of Hellenic culture, xii. 357 *seq.*; cities founded in Asia by, xii. 360; Asia not Hellenized by, xii. 362; increased intercommunication produced by the conquests of, xii. 366 *seq.*; his interest in science and literature, xii. 369; state of the Grecian world when he crossed the Hellespont, xii. 370; possibility of emancipating Greece during his earlier Asiatic campaigns, xii. 371; his rescript directing the recall of Grecian exiles, xii. 416 *seq.*; his family and generals, after his death, xii. 429 *seq.*; partition of the empire of, xii. 430, 454; list of projects entertained by, at the time of his death, xii. 431.

Alexander, son of Alexander the Great, xii. 449, 459, 461, 493, 495, 501.

Alexander, son of Polysperchon, xii. 469, 494, 497, 499.

Alexander, son of Kassander, xii. 525.

Alexander, king of the Molossians, xii. 533 *seq.*

Alexander, son of Amyntas, x. 340, 341.

Alexander of Epirus, marriage of, xi. 710.

Alexander, the Lynkestian, xi. 713 *seq.*

Alexander of Pheræ, x. 339, 340; expeditions of Pelopidas against, x. 340, 360, 415, 420 *seq.*, 423 *n.* 3; seizure of Pelopidas and Ismenias by, x. 387 *seq.*; release of Pelopidas and Ismenias by, x. 390; subdued by the Thebans, x. 423 *seq.*; naval hostilities of, against Athens, x. 509; cruelties and assassination of, xi. 287 *seq.*

Alexandreia Trôas, i. 441.

Alexandria in Egypt, xii. 198; ad Caucasum, xii. 271; in Ariis, and in Arachosia, xii. 271 *n.*; ad Jaxartem, xii. 277, 278.

Alexandrine chronology from the return of the Herakleids to the first Olympiad, ii. 409.

Alexiklês, viii. 87, 91, 93.

Alkæus, Herodôtus's mistake about, iii. 208 *n.*; his flight from battle, iii. 269; opposition of, to Pittakus, iii. 270, iv. 120 *seq.*; collected works of, iv. 121 *n.* 4; subjective character of his poetry, i. 490.
Alkamenês, son of Têleklus, ii. 565.
Alkamenês, appointment of, to go to Lesbos, vii. 502; defeat and death of, vii, 508.
Alkestis and Admêtus, i. 155 *seq.*
Alketas, x. 188, 199 *n.*, 208, xi. 33.
Alkibiades, reputed oration of Andokidês against, iv. 202 *n.* 3, vi. 9 *n.* 2; alleged duplication of the tribute-money of Athenian allies by, vi. 9 *n.* 2; at the battle of Delium, vi. 541; education and character of, vii. 42 *seq.*; and Sokratês, vii. 47 *seq.*; conflicting sentiments entertained towards, vii. 55; attempts of, to revive his family tie with Sparta, vii. 57; early politics of, vii. 56; adoption of anti-Laconian politics by, vii. 58; attempt of, to ally Argos with Athens, B.C. 420, vii. 58; trick of, upon the Lacedæmonian envoys, vii. 61 *seq.*; display of, at the Olympic festival, vii. 72 *seq.*, 74 *n.*; intra-Peloponnesian policy of, B.C. 419, vii. 84 *seq.*; expedition of, into the interior of Peloponnesus, B.C. 419, vii. 86; at Argos, B.C. 418, vii. 102, and B.C. 416, vii. 138; and Nikias, projected contention of ostracism between, vii. 144 *seq.*; his support of the Egestæan envoys at Athens, B.C. 416, vii. 198; and the Sicilian expedition, vii. 201, 207 *seq.*, 218 *seq.*; attack upon, in connexion with the mutilation of the Hermæ, vii. 235, 239, 284 *seq.*; the Eleusinian mysteries and, vii. 239 *seq.*, 282 *seq.*, viii. 203; plan of action in Sicily proposed by, vii. 261; at Messênê in Sicily, vii. 264; at Katana, vii. 265; recall of, to take his trial, vii. 266, 286 *seq.*; escape and condemnation of, vii. 288 *seq.*, 320 *n.* 2; at Sparta, vii. 320 *seq.*; Lacedæmonians persuaded by, to send aid to Chios, vii. 505; expedition of, to Chios, vii. 509 *seq.*; revolt of Milêtus from Athens, caused by, vii. 516; order from Sparta to kill, viii. 2; escape of, to Tissaphernês, viii. 3; advice of, to Tissaphernês, viii. 4; acts as interpreter between Tissaphernês and the Greeks, viii. 6 *seq.*; oligarchical conspiracy of, with the Athenian officers at Samos, viii. 8 *seq.*; counter-manœuvres of, against Phrynichus, viii. 16; proposed restoration of, to Athens, viii. 16, 18; negotiations of, with Peisander, viii. 20, 27 *seq.*; and the Athenian democracy at Samos, viii. 67 *seq.*, 71, 74 *seq.*; at Aspendus, viii. 135; return of, from Aspendus to Samos, viii. 156; arrival of, at the Hellespont, from Samos, viii. 158; arrest of Tissaphernês by, viii. 161; escape of, from Sardis, viii. 162; and the Athenian fleet, at the Bosphorus, viii. 170; attack upon Chalkêdon by, viii. 170; occupation of Chrysopolis by, viii. 171; and Thrasyllus, at the Hellespont, viii. 176; capture of Chalkêdon by, viii. 178; and Pharnabazus, viii. 180; proceedings of, in Thrace and Asia, B.C. 407, viii. 195; return of, to Athens, B.C. 407, viii. 196 *seq.*; expedition of, to Asia, B.C. 407, viii. 206 *seq.*; dissatisfaction of the armament at Samos with, viii. 210; accusations against, at Athens, B.C. 407, viii. 211; alteration of sentiment towards, at Athens, B.C. 407, viii. 212 *seq.*; and Nikias, different behaviour of the Athenians towards, viii. 215; dismissal of, from his command, B.C. 407, viii. 216; at Ægospotami, viii. 295; position and views of, in Asia, after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 426 *seq.*; assassination of, viii. 427 *seq.*; character of, viii. 430 *seq.*
Alkidas, vi. 321, 324 *seq.*, 368 *seq.*
Alkmæôn, i. 381 *seq.*
Alkmæônids, curse, trial and condemnation of, iii. 113; proceedings of, against Hippias, iv. 160; rebuilding of Delphian temple by, iv. 162; false imputation of treachery on, at the battle of Marathon, iv. 482; demand of Sparta for the expulsion of, vi. 132.
Alkman, iv. 104, 111, 114 *seq.*
Alkmênê, i. 126.
Allegorical interpretation of mythes, i. 562 *seq.*, 569, 584.
Allegory rarely admissible in the interpretation of mythes, i. 2.
Alôids, the, i. 186.
Alos, sanguinary rites at, i. 171.
Althæa and the burning brand, i. 198.
Althæmenês, founder of Rhodes, ii. 41.
Althæmenês and Katreus, i. 306.
Alyattês and Kyaxarês, iii. 313; war of, with Milêtus, iii. 344 *seq.*; sacrilege committed by, iii. 345; long reign, death and sepulchre of, iii. 346.
Amaltheia, the horn of, i. 205.
Amanus, Mount, march of Darius to, xii. 155.
Amasis, iii. 447 *seq.*; death of, iv. 296.
Amasis and Polykratês, iv. 324.
Amastris, xii. 633 *seq.*
Amazons, legend of, i. 286 *seq.*
Ambrakia, iii. 544, 546.
Ambrakiots, attack of, upon Amphilochian Argos, vi. 244; attack of, upon Akarnania, vi. 261 *seq.*; projected attack of, on Amphilochian Argos, vi. 408; defeat of, at Olpæ, vi. 411; Menedæus's desertion of, vi. 413 *seq.*; Demosthenês's victory over, vi. 415 *seq.*; pacific convention of, with the Akarnanians and Amphilochians, vi. 421.
Ambrysus, re-fortification of, xi. 682.
Ammon, Alexander's visit to the oracle of, xii. 200.
Amnesty decreed by Solon, iii. 137; proposed by Patrokleidês, viii. 305; at Athens, B.C. 403, viii. 401, 409 *seq.*
Amompharetus, v. 237 *seq.*

Amorgês, vii. 504; capture of, vii. 535.
Amphiaräus, i. 369, 373.
Amphiktyon, i. 136, 137, 142.
Amphiktyonic assembly, i. 137, ii. 328 *seq.*, xi. 339; condemnation of Sparta by, x. 275 *seq.*; accusation of Thebes against Sparta before, xi. 341; accusation of Thebes against Phokis before, xi. 342; resistance of Phokis to, xi. 343 *seq.*; sentence of, against the Phokians, and honours conferred upon Philip by, xi. 588, 592; at Delphi, B.C. 339, xi. 650 *seq.*
Amphiktyonies, or exclusive religious partnerships, ii. 325 *seq.*, 332.
Amphiktyons, punishment of the Kirrhæans by, iv. 84; establishment of the Pythian games by, iv. 86; violent measures of, against the Amphissians, xi. 655 *seq.*
Amphiktyony at Kalauria, i. 183.
Amphilochian Argos, Eurylochus's projected attack upon, vi. 408.
Amphilochians and Akarnanians, pacific treaty of, with the Ambrakiots, vi. 421.
Amphilochus, i. 384; wanderings of, i. 423.
Amphiôn and Zethus, i. 358 *seq.*; Homeric legend of, i. 349.
Amphipolis, foundation of, vi. 16 *seq.*; acquisition of, by Brasidas, vi. 554 *seq.*; proceedings of Brasidas in, vi. 574; policy of Kleon and Nikias for the recovery of, vi. 625 *seq.*; Kleon's expedition against, vi. 630 *seq.*; topography of, vi. 634 *seq.*; battle of, vi. 638 *seq.*; negotiations for peace after the battle of, vi. 668; not restored to Athens, on the Peace of Nikias, vii. 5; neglect of, by the Athenians, vii. 142, xi. 304; claim of Athens to, x. 336 *seq.*, 402; Iphikrates at, x. 344, 409; failure of Timotheus at, x. 413; nine defeats of the Athenians at, x. 413 *n.* 2; Kallisthenes at, x. 510; Philip renounces his claim to, xi. 300; siege and capture of, by Philip, xi. 326 *seq.*; Philip's dealings with the Athenians respecting, xi. 331.
Amphissa, capture of, by Philip, xi. 687.
Amphissians, accusation of, against Athens, xi. 650 *seq.*; violent proceedings of the Amphiktyons against, xi. 655 *seq.*
Amphitryôn, i. 126.
Amphoterus and Akarnan, i. 384.
Amyklæ, ii. 440; conquest of, ii. 564.
Amykus, i. 231.
Amyntas, and the Peisistratids, iv. 25.
Amyntas, father of Philip, x. 65 *seq.*, 332 *seq.*; and the Olynthian confederacy, x. 67, 76, 78, 88; and Iphikrates, x. 146; and Athens, x. 333, 336; death of, x. 340; assistance of Iphikrates to the family of, x. 342.
Amyntas, son of Antiochus, xii. 11, 157, 169.
Amyntas, son of Perdikkas, xii. 10.
Anaktorium, iii. 544 *seq.*, vi. 489.
Anaphê, i. 327.
Anapus, crossing of, by Dion, xi. 126.
Anaxagoras, vi. 137.
Anaxandrides, bigamy of, ii. 521.
Anaxarchus of Abdera, xii. 287, 290, 293.
Anaxibius, ix. 210 *seq.*, 223 *seq.*; in the Hellespont, ix. 511; death of, ix. 513 *seq.*
Anaxikratês, v. 455.
Anaxilaus, v. 286, 287, 311.
Anaximander, iv. 519 *seq.*; map of, iv. 386.
Anaximenês of Lampsacus, i. 550.
Andokidês, reputed oration of, against Alkibiadês, iv. 202 *n.* 3, vi. 9 *n.* 2; de Mysteriis, iv. 165 *n.* 3; and the mutilation of the Hermæ, vii. 273, 276 *seq.*
Androgeos, death of, i. 302.
Androklus, iii. 243.
Andromachê and Helenus, i. 413.
Andromachus, xi. 207.
Andrôn, story of, respecting Krête, ii. 39.
Andros, siege of, by Themistoklês, v. 192; siege of, by Alkibiadês and Konon, viii. 206.
Animals, worship of, in Egypt, iii. 430.
Ankæus, i. 244.
Antalkidas, embassy of, to Tiribazus, ix. 498 *seq.*; embassies of, to Persia, ix. 531, x. 213; in the Hellespont, ix. 533; the peace of, ix. 534 *seq.*, x. 1 *seq.*
Antandrus, expulsion of Arsakes from, viii. 153; the Syracusans at, x. 533.
Ante-Hellenic inhabitants of Greece, ii. 350; colonies from Phœnicia and Egypt not probable, ii. 357.
Antênôr, i. 413, 431.
Antigonê, i. 375.
Antigonus and Perdikkas, xii. 450; and Eumenes, xii. 455; great power of, xii. 495; alliance of Kassander, Lysimachus and Ptolemy against, xii. 496, 502, 517, 522; measures of, against Kassander, xii. 498, 500; pacification of, with Kassander, Lysimachus, and Ptolemy, xii. 501; Roxana and her son Alexander put to death by, xii. 501; murders Kleopatra, sister of Alexander, xii. 503; Athenian envoys sent to, xii. 513; death of, xii, 522.
Antigonus Conatas, xii. 526.
Antilochus, death of, i. 405.
Antimachus of Kolophôn, i. 365.
Antiochus, at Samos and Notium, viii. 208, 209.
Antiochus, the Arcadian, x. 381.
Antiopê, i. 358 *seq.*
Antipater, embassy of, from Philip to Athens, xi. 535, 537, 541, 551, 555; made viceroy of Macedonia, xii. 90, 92; and Olympias, xii. 92, 311; defeat of Agis by, xii. 382; submission of all Greece to, xii. 383; Grecian hostilities against, after Alexander's death, xii. 421 *seq.*; and Kraterus, xii. 432 *seq.*, 452; victory of, at Krannon, xii. 433, 434; terms imposed upon Athens by, xii. 436 *seq.*; remodels the Peloponnesian cities, xii. 447; contest and pacification of, with the Ætolians, xii. 447; made guardian of Alexander's family, xii. 454; death of, xii. 455; last directions of, xii. 457.
Antipater, son of Kassander, xii. 525.

Antiphilus, xii. 426, 434.
Antiphon, viii. 21, 41 *seq.*, 85 *seq.*, 113 *seq.*
Antiquity, Grecian, a religious conception, i. 596; stripped of its religious character by chronology, i. 597.
Antisthenês, at Kaunus, vii. 545.
Antistrophê, introduction of, iv. 119.
Anytus, viii. 147, 330.
Aornos, rock of, xii. 301 *n.*, 305.
Apatê, i. 9.
Apaturia, excitement at the, after the battle of Arginusæ, viii. 260 *seq.*
Aphareus, i. 236, 237.
Apheidas, i. 242.
Aphepsion and Mantitheus, vii. 273.
Aphetæ, Persian fleet at, v. 133, 135, 138.
Aphroditê, i. 7, 73.
Apis, i. 114.
Apodeiktæ, iv. 181.
Apollo, i. 13; legends of, i. 61 *seq.*, 69; worship and functions of, i. 67 *seq.*, iii. 238; and Laomedon, i. 77, 388; and Hermês, i. 81; types of, i. 83; and Admêtus, i. 155; and Korônis, i. 245; Sminthius, i. 455; evidence of the Homeric Hymn to, as to early Ionic life, iii. 227; temple of, at Klarus, iii. 248; reply of Delphian, to the remonstrance of Crœsus, iv. 261.
Apollodôrus, his genealogy of Hellên, i. 136 *seq.*
Apollodôrus and the Theôric fund, xi. 485.
Apollokrates, xi. 146, 149, 164.
Apollonia, iii. 547 *seq.*; and the Illyrians, iv. 7 *seq*; and the Olynthian confederacy, x. 71.
Apollonides, xii. 192, 203.
Apriês, reign and death of, iii. 446 *seq.*
Apsyrtus, i. 325.
Arabia, Alexander's projects with regard to, xii. 330, 336.
Arachosia, Alexander in, xii. 270.
Aradus, surrender of, to Alexander, xii. 175.
Arbela, battle of, xii. 210 *seq.*
Arbitration at Athens, v. 482.
Arcadia, ii. 404; state of, B.C. 560, ii. 594 *seq.*; and Sparta, ii. 600 *seq.*, v. 427; proceedings in, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 278 *seq.*; invasions of, by Archidamus, x. 363, 433 *seq.*; mission of Epaminondas to, x. 395; dissensions in, x. 441 *seq.*; embassy of Æschines to, xi. 510.
Arcadians, ii. 407, 594 *seq.*; sympathy of, with Messenians, ii. 588; impulse of, towards a Pan-Arcadian union, x. 283; application of, to Athens and Thebes, for aid against Sparta, x. 290; Epaminoudas and the consolidation of, x. 293; energetic action and insolence of, x. 354 *seq.*; envoy to Persia from, x. 380, 384; protest of, against the headship of Thebes, x. 385; alliance of Athens with, x. 394; and Eleians, x. 430 *seq.*, 444; occupation and plunder of Olympia by, x. 431, 440 *seq.*; celebration of the Olympic games by, x. 436 *seq.*; seizure of, at Tegea, by the Theban harmost, x. 445 *seq.*
Archagathus, xii. 592, 593, 599, 600.
Archêgetês Apollo, i. 67.
Archelaus, x. 61 *seq.*; siege of Pydna by, viii. 159.
Archeptolemus, viii. 113 *seq.*
Archias, œkist of Syracuse, iii. 487.
Archias, the Theban, x. 113, 116, 117.
Archias, the Exile-Hunter, xii. 440 *seq.*
Archidamus II., speech of, against war with Athens, vi. 118 *seq.*; invasions of Attica by, vi. 170 *seq.*, 208, 299; his expedition to Platæa, vi. 250 *seq.*
Archidamus III., invasions of Arcadia by, x. 363, 433 *seq.*; and the independence of Messenê, x. 398, 495; and Philomelus, xi. 347; expedition of, against Megalopolis, xi. 419; aid to the Phokians at Thermopylæ under, xi. 579, 582, xii. 378, 532.
Archilochus, i. 489, iv. 35, 104, 107 *seq.*
Archinus, decrees of, viii. 409, 421.
Architects at Athens, under Periklês, vi. 31.
Architecture, Grecian, between B.C. 600–550, iv. 134.
Archonides, x. 652.
Archons after Kodrus, iii. 65; the nine, iii. 100; judges without appeal till after Kleisthenês, iii. 175; effect of Kleisthenês's revolution on, iv. 182 *seq.*, 191 *seq.*; limited functions of, after the Persian war, v. 376; limitation of the functions of, by Periklês, v. 481, 484, 497.
Ardys, iii. 304.
Areopagus, *senate of*, iii. 98; and the Ephetæ, iii. 106; and the Eumenides of Æschylus, iii. 108 *n.*; powers of, enlarged by Solon, iii. 164; under the Solonian and Kleisthenean constitutions, iv. 200; in early Athens, v. 477 *seq.*; oligarchical tendencies of, v. 480; venerable character and large powers of, v. 485; at variance with the growing democratical sentiment, B.C. 480–460, v. 487; a centre of action for the oligarchical party, v. 488; power of, abridged by Periklês and Ephialtês, v. 496 *seq.*
Arês, i. 13.
Aretê, xi. 75, 77, 114, 181.
Argadeis, iii. 69.
Argæus and Philip, xi. 300.
Arganthônius and the Phôkæans, iv. 274.
Argeian Demos, proceedings of, vii. 136.
Argeian genealogies, i. 113.
Argeians, attempts of, to recover Thyrea, ii. 606; defeat and destruction of, by Kleomenês, iv. 433; trick of, with their calendar, vii. 89; at Epidaurus, vii. 94, 96, 122; at the battle within the Long Walls of Corinth, ix. 465; manœuvres of, respecting the holy truce, ix. 493; and the peace of Antalkidas, ix. 537; and Mardonius, v. 213.
Argês, i. 6.
Argilus, acquisition of, by Brasidas, vi. 554 *seq.*
Arginusæ, battle of, viii. 231 *seq.*; recall, impeachment, defence, and condemnation of

the generals at the battle of, viii. 242–285; inaction of the Athenian fleet after the battle of, viii. 292.
Argô, the, i. 316.
Argonautic expedition, i. 316 *seq.*; monuments of, i. 329 *seq.*; how and when attached to Kolchis, i. 340; attempts to reconcile the, with geographical knowledge, i. 345 *seq.*; continued faith in, i. 347; Dr. Warton and M. Ginguené on the, i. 642 *n.*
Argos, rise of, coincident with the decline of Mykênæ, i. 228; occupation of, by the Dorians, ii. 11; and neighbouring Dorians greater than Sparta in 776 B.C., ii. 413; Dorian settlements in, ii. 414, 416, 419; early ascendency of, ii. 420, 430; subsequent decline of, ii. 432; acquisitions of Sparta from, ii. 604 *seq.*; military classification at, ii. 619; struggles of, to recover the headship of Greece, ii. 623 *seq.*; and Kleônæ, ii. 625; victorious war of Sparta against, B.C. 496–5, iv. 432 *seq.*; prostration of, B.C. 496–5, iv. 438; assistance of, to Ægina, v. 68; neutrality of, on the invasion of Xerxes, v. 88 *seq.*; position of, on its alliance with Athens about B.C. 461, v. 433 *seq.*; uncertain relations between Sparta and, B.C. 421, vii. 4; position of, on the Peace of Nikias, vii. 15 *seq.*; the Thousand-regiment at, vii. 16; induced by the Corinthians to head a new Peloponnesian alliance, B.C. 421, vii. 17; joined by Mantinea, vii. 18; joined by the Corinthians, vii. 22, 24; joined by Elis, vii. 24; refusal of Tegea to join, vii. 27; and Sparta, projected alliance between, vii. 33; and Bœotia, projected alliance between, vii. 33 *seq.*; conclusion of a fifty years' peace between Sparta and, vii. 37 *seq.*; and Athens, alliance between, vii. 58, 68 *seq.*; embassy from, for alliance with Corinth, vii. 84; attack of, upon Epidaurus, vii. 87, 90; invasion of, by the Lacedæmonians and their allies, B.C. 418, vii. 96 *seq.*; Alkibiadês at, B.C. 418, vii. 102; political change at, through the battle of Mantinea, B.C. 418, vii. 123 *seq.*; treaty of peace between Sparta and, B.C. 418, vii. 125 *seq.*; alliance between Sparta and, B.C. 418, vii. 128; renounces alliance with Athens, Elis and Mantinea, vii. 128; oligarchical revolution at, vii. 130, 132; restoration of democracy at, vii. 135; renewed alliance of, with Athens, vii. 137; Alkibiadês at, B.C. 416, vii. 138; Lacedæmonian intervention in behalf of the oligarchy at, vii. 138, 139; envoys from, to the Athenian Demos at Samos, viii. 77; alliance of, with Thebes, Athens, and Corinth, against Sparta, ix. 419; consolidation of Corinth with, ix. 462; expedition of Agesipolis against, ix. 493 *seq.*; violent intestine feud at, x. 271 *seq.*
Argos, Amphilochian, capture of, by Phormio, vi. 163; attack of Ambrakiots on, vi. 214; Eurylochus's projected attack upon, vi. 408.
Argus, destruction of Argeians in the grove of, iv. 434.
Aria, Alexander in, xii. 257.
Ariadnê, i. 303 *seq.*
Ariæus, flight of, after the battle of Kunaxa, ix. 63; and Klearchus, ix. 69, 72; and the Greeks after the battle of Kunaxa, ix. 73, 75, 83, 102.
Aridæus, Philip, xii. 429, 430, 450.
Ariobarzanes, intervention of, in Greece, x. 357; revolt of, x. 403 *seq.*; at the Susian Gates, xii. 232; death of, xii. 234.
Arion, iv. 117 *seq.*
Aristagoras and Megabatês, iv. 382; revolt of, iv. 383 *seq.*, 393; application of, to Sparta, iv. 386 *seq.*; application of, to Athens, iv. 389; march of, to Sardis, iv. 391; desertion of the Ionic revolt by, iv. 398 *seq.*
Aristarchus, the Athenian, viii. 112.
Aristarchus, the Lacedæmonian, ix. 225 *seq.*
Aristeidês, constitutional change introduced by, iv. 195; character of, iv. 458 *seq.*; elected general, iv. 461; banishment of, by ostracism, v. 69; and Themistoklês, rivalry between, v. 69, 371; restoration of, from banishment, v. 151; joins the Greek fleet at Salamis, v. 177; slaughters the Persians at Psyttaleia, v. 186; equitable assessment of, upon the allied Greeks, v. 357 *seq.*; popularity of, after the Persian war, v. 377; death and poverty of, v. 392.
Aristeus, vi. 96, 100 *seq.*, 247.
Aristo and Agêtus, iv. 440.
Aristocrats, Grecian, bad morality of, vi. 383.
Aristodêmus, ii. 2 *seq.*
Aristodêmus, king of Messenia, ii. 574.
Aristodêmus Malakus, iii. 480.
Aristodêmus, "the coward," v. 129, 255.
Aristodêmus the actor, xi. 517, 518.
Aristodikus, iv. 271.
Aristogeitôn and Harmodius, iv. 149 *seq.*
Aristoklês and Hipponoidas, vii. 115, 121.
Aristokratês, king of Orchomenus, ii. 576, 588.
Aristokratês, the Athenian, vii. 507.
Aristomachê, x. 669.
Aristomenês, ii. 569, 576 *seq.*
Aristonikus of Methymna, xii. 192, 203.
Aristophanês, viii. 450; his reason for showing up Sokratês, viii. 562; his attack upon the alleged impiety of Sokratês, i. 538 *n.*; and Kleon, vi. 657 *seq.*, 666.
Aristoteles the Spartan, xi. 2.
Aristotle on Spartan women, ii. 516; on the Spartan laws of property, ii. 551; meaning of the word Sophist in, viii. 484; formal logic of, viii. 590; novelties ascribed to Sokratês by, viii. 583; and Hermeias, xi. 610, 611 *n.*; instruction of Alexander by, xii. 4; and Alexander, political views of, compared, xii. 357 *seq.*
Aristoxenus of Tarentum, xi. 218.
Aristus and Nikoteles, x. 647.

Arkas and Kallisto, i. 242.
Arkesilaus the Second, iv. 57; the Third, iv. 61 *seq.*
Arklinus, Æthiopis of, ii. 209.
Armenia, the Ten Thousand Greeks in, ix. 139 *seq.*
Armenus, i. 330.
Arnold, his edition of Thucydides, viii. 155 *n.*
Arrhibæus, vi. 545, 600, 604 *seq.*
Arrian on the Amazons, i. 295 *seq.*; conjecture of, respecting Geryôn, i. 339; on Darius's plan against Alexander, xii. 148.
Arsakes at Antandrus, viii. 153.
Arsames, xii. 151.
Arsinoë, xii. 631 *seq.*
Arsites, xii. 105, 107.
Art, Grecian, iv. 132 *seq.*
Artabanus, v. 10 *seq.*
Artabazus, Xerxes's general, siege of Potidæa and Olynthus by, v. 202; jealousy of, against Mardonius, v. 218; conduct of, at and after the battle of Platæa, v. 244, 247; and Pausanias, v. 346, 364.
Artabæus, satrap of Daskylium, xi. 324, 361, 418.
Artabazus, Darius's general, xii. 248, 249, 255.
Artaphernês, satrap of Sardis, Hippias's application to, iv. 372; and Histiæus, iv. 402, 417; proceedings of, after the reconquest of Ionia, iv. 420; and Datis, Persian armament under, iv. 444; return of, to Asia, after the battle of Marathon, iv. 489.
Artaphernês, the Persian envoy, vi. 490 *seq.*
Artaxerxes Longimanus, v. 387 *seq.*, vi. 490 *seq.*
Artaxerxes Mnemon, accession of, ix. 9; and Cyrus the Younger, viii. 427, ix. 9, 56 *seq.*; at Kunaxa, ix. 56 *seq.*, 64, 70; death of, x. 505.
Artayktês, v. 272 *seq.*
Artemis, i. 13; worship of, in Asia, iii. 238.
Artemis Limnatis, temple of, ii. 571.
Artemisia, v. 163, 184, 190.
Artemisium, resolution of Greeks to oppose Xerxes at, v. 98; Greek fleet at, v. 109, 110, 133 *seq.*; sea-fight off, v. 136, 139; retreat of the Greek fleet from, to Salamis, v. 140.
Arthur, romances of, i. 635.
Artisans, at Athens, iii. 182 *seq.*
Arts, rudimentary state of, in Homeric and Hesiodic Greece, ii. 157.
Aryandes, Persian satrap of Egypt, iv. 64.
Asia, twelve Ionic cities in, iii. 232 *seq.*; Æolic cities in, iii. 257 *seq.*; collective civilization in, without individual freedom or development, iii. 406; state of, before the Persian monarchy, iv. 245; conquests of Cyrus the Great in, iv. 282; expedition of Greek fleet against, B.C. 478, v. 343; Alkibiadês in, viii. 195, 206 *seq.*, 426 *seq.*; expedition of Timotheus to, x. 345, 402 *seq.*; Agesilaus in, x. 402, 405; measures of Alexander before going to, xii. 90; passage of Alexander to, xii. 93; review of Alexander's army in, xii. 96; cities founded by Alexander in, xii. 360; Hellenized by the Diadochi, not by Alexander, xii. 362; how far really Hellenized, xii. 363.
Asia Minor, Greeks in, ii. 313; non-Hellenic people of, iii. 276, 278 *seq.*; features of the country of, iii. 277; Phrygian music and worship among Greeks in, iii. 290; predominance of female influence in the legends of, iii. 301; Cimmerian invasion of, iii. 336 *seq.*; conquest of, by the Persians, iv. 280; arrival of Cyrus the Younger in, viii. 184, 187.
Asia, Upper, Scythian invasion of, iii. 342.
Asiatic customs and religion blended with Hellenic in the Trôad, i. 456.
Asiatic Dorians, iii. 273, 274.
Asiatic frenzy grafted on the joviality of the Grecian Dionysia, i. 48.
Asiatic Greece, deposition of despots of, by Aristagoras, iv. 384.
Asiatic Greeks, conquest of, by Crœsus, iii. 348 *seq.*; state of, after Cyrus's conquest of Lydia, iv. 267; application of, to Sparta, B.C. 546, iv. 268; alliance with, against Persia, abandoned by the Athenians, iv. 392; successes of Persians against, iv. 396; reconquest of, after the fall of Milêtus, iv. 413; first step to the ascendency of Athens over, v. 269; not tributary to Persia between B.C. 477 and 412, v. 458 *n.*; surrender of, to Persia, by Sparta, ix. 284; and Cyrus the Younger, ix. 285; and Tissaphernes, ix. 286; application of, to Sparta for aid against Tissaphernes, ix. 287; after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 34 *seq.*; Spartan project for the rescue of, x. 59.
Asidates, ix. 238.
Askalaphus and Ialmenus, i. 178.
Asklepiadês of Myrlea, legendary discoveries of, i. 337 *n.* 2.
Asklepiads, i. 248.
Asklêpius, i. 246 *seq.*
Asopius, son of Phormio, vi. 313.
Asôpus, Greeks and Persians at, before the battle of Platæa, v. 224 *seq.*
Aspasia, vi. 134 *seq.*
Aspendus, Phenician fleet at, B.C. 411, viii. 134, 136, 154; Alkibiadês at, viii. 135; Alkibiadês' return from, to Samos, viii. 156; Alexander at, xii. 135.
Aspis, xii. 569.
Assembly, Spartan popular, ii. 465, 480; Athenian judicial, iv. 183, 188 *seq.*; Athenian political, iv. 186.
Assyria, relations of, with Egypt, iii. 433.
Assyrian kings, their command of human labour, iii. 405.
Assyrians and Medes, iii. 304 *seq.*, 390 *seq.*; contrasted with Phenicians, Greeks, and Egyptians, iii. 407; and Phenicians, effect of, on the Greek mind, iii. 458 *seq.*
Astakus, vi. 183, 191.
Asteria, i. 8.
Asterius, i. 301.

Astræus, i. 8; and Eôs, children of, i. 8.
Astronomy, physical, thought impious by ancient Greeks, i. 468 *n.*; and physics, knowledge of, among the early Greeks, ii. 154.
Astyages, story of, iv. 247 *seq.*
Astyanax, death of, i. 413.
Astyochus, expedition of, to Ionia, vii. 525; at Lesbos, vii. 527; at Chios and the opposite coast, vii. 537; accidental escape of, vii. 539; and Pedaritus, vii. 539, 541; and Tissaphernês, treaty between, vii. 543 *seq.*; mission of Lichas and others respecting, vii. 546; victory of, over Charmînus, and junction with Antisthenês, vii. 547; at Rhodes, viii. 126; at Milêtus, viii. 131; recall of, viii. 133.
Atalanta, i. 76, 89 *seq.*
Atarneus captured and garrisoned by Derkyllidas, ix. 303; Hermeias of, xi. 610, 611 *n.*
Até, i. 9.
Athamas, i. 168 *seq.*
Athenagoras, vii. 252 *seq.*
Athénê, birth of, i. 13; various representations of, i. 74; her dispute with Poseidon, i. 77, 266; Chalkiœkus, temple of, and Pausanias, v. 369; Polias, reported prodigy in the temple of, on Xerxes' approach, v. 149.
Athenian victims for the Minôtaur, i. 303; ceremonies commemorative of the destruction of the Minôtaur, i. 304; democracy, Kleisthenês the real author of, iv. 187; people, judicial attributes of, iv. 188; nobles, early violence of, iv. 205; energy, development of, after Kleisthenês's revolution, iv. 238; seamen, contrasted with the Ionians at Ladê, iv. 409; dikasts, temper of, in estimating past services, iv. 502; democracy, origin of the apparent fickleness of, iv. 507 *seq.*; envoy, speech of, to Gelo, v. 295; parties and politics, effect of the Persian war upon, v. 372 *seq.*; empire, v. 395 *seq.*, 413 *n.* 2, 464, vi. 54, *seq.*, 59 *n.*, 64, viii. 384–397; power, increase of, after the formation of the Delian confederacy, v. 424; auxiliaries to Sparta against the Helots, v. 429 *seq.*; democracy, consummation of, v. 515; armament against Samos, under Periklês, Sophoklês, &c., vi. 37 *seq.*; private citizens, redress of the allies against, vi. 56; assembly, speeches of the Korkyræan and Corinthian envoys to, vi. 79 *seq.*; naval attack, vi. 87; envoy, reply of, to the Corinthian envoy, at the Spartan assembly, vi. 115 *seq.*; expedition to ravage Peloponnesus, B.C. 431, vi. 182; armament to Potidæa and Chalkidic Thrace, B.C. 429, vi. 259; assembly, debates in, respecting Mitylênê, vi. 331, 337 *seq.*; assembly, about the Lacedæmonian prisoners in Sphakteria, vi. 441 *seq.*; assembly, on Demosthenes' application for reinforcements to attack Sphakteria, vi. 454 *seq.*; hoplites, at the battle of Amphipolis, vi. 652; fleet, operations of, near Messênê and Rhegium, B.C. 425, vii. 183; assembly, and the expedition to Sicily, vii. 201, 203 *seq.*, 383; treasury, abundance in, B.C. 415, vii. 225; fleet in the harbour of Syracuse, vii. 407, 409 *seq.*, 434 *seq.*, 445 *seq.*; prisoners at Syracuse, vii. 474 *seq.*; fleet at Samos, B.C. 412, vii. 537; democracy, securities in, against corruption, vii. 553; assembly, vote of, in favour of oligarchical change, viii. 20; assembly, at Kolônus, viii. 47; democracy, reconstitution of, at Samos, viii. 64; squadron, escape of, from Sestos to Elæus, viii. 142; fleet at Kynossêma, viii. 147 *seq.*; fleet at Abydos, viii. 157; fleet, concentration of, at Kardia, viii. 162; fleet at the Bosphorus, B.C. 410, viii. 170; fleet at Arginusæ, viii. 231 *seq.*; assembly, debates in, on the generals at Arginusæ, viii. 246–260, 265–275; fleet, inaction of, after the battle of Arginusæ, viii. 292; fleet, removal of, from Samos to Ægospotami, viii. 294; fleet, capture of, at Ægospotami, viii. 295 *seq.*; kleruchs and allies after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 304; tragedy, growth of, viii. 435, 437; mind, influence of comedy on, viii. 451 *seq.*; character not corrupted between B.C. 480 and 405, viii. 511 *seq.*; confederacy, new, B.C. 378, x. 139 *seq.*; and Theban cavalry, battle of, near Mantinea, B.C. 362, x. 458 *seq.*; marine, reform in the administration of, by Demosthenês, xi. 639 *seq.*
Athenians and the Hêrakleids, i. 129; and Sigeium, i. 457; and Samians, contrast between, iv. 333; active patriotism of, between B.C. 500–400, iv. 242; diminished active sentiment of, after the Thirty Tyrants, iv. 243; alliance with Asiatic Greeks abandoned by, iv. 392; Darius's revenge against, iv. 401; terror and sympathy of, on the capture of Milêtus, iv. 418; appeal of, to Sparta, against the Medism of Ægina, iv. 429; condition and character of, B.C. 490, iv. 451; application of, to Sparta, before the battle of Marathon, iv. 462; victory of, at Marathon, iv. 463 *seq.*, 481; alleged fickleness and ingratitude of, towards Miltiadês, iv. 499 *seq.*; answers of the Delphian oracle to, on the eve of Xerxes's invasion, v. 81; Pan-Hellenic patriotism of, on Xerxes's invasion, v. 85 *seq.*; hopeless situation of, after the battle of Thermopylæ, v. 147; conduct of, on the approach of Xerxes, v. 148 *seq.*; victory of, at Salamis, v. 152, 164 *seq.*; honour awarded to, after the battle of Salamis, v. 197; under Pausanias in Bœotia, v. 222; and Alexander of Macedon, before the battle of Platæa, v. 231; and Spartans at Platæa, v. 232, 237; victory of, at Platæa, v. 240 *seq.*; and continental Ionians, after the battle of Mykalê, v. 269; attack the Chersonese, B.C. 479,

v. 270; the leaders of Grecian progress after the battle of Salamis, v. 328; rebuild their city, after the battle of Platæa, v. 330; effect of the opposition to the fortification of Athens upon, v. 335; induced by Themistoklês to build twenty new triremes annually, v. 342; activity of, in the first ten years of their hegemony, v. 399 *seq.*, 412; renounce the alliance of Sparta, and join Argos and Thessaly, v. 433 *seq.*; proceedings of, in Cyprus, Phœnicia, Egypt, and Megara, B.C. 460, v. 436; defeat the Æginetans, B.C. 459, v. 438; defeat of, at Tanagra, v. 445; victory of, at Œnophyta, v. 448; sail round Peloponnesus under Tolmidês, v. 450; march against Thessaly, v. 451; defeat and losses of, in Egypt, B.C. 460–455, v. 451; victories of, at Cyprus, under Anaxikratês, v. 455; defeat of, at Korôneia, v. 471; personal activity of, after the reforms of Periklês and Ephialtês, vi. 1; settlements of, in the Ægean, during the Thirty years' truce, vi. 15; pride of, in the empire of Athens, vi. 12; decision of, respecting Corinth and Korkyra, vi. 84; victory of, near Potidæa, vi. 100; blockade of Potidæa by, vi. 101; counter-demand of, upon Sparta, for expiation of sacrilege, vi. 143; final answer of, to the Spartans before the Peloponnesian war, vi. 150; expel the Æginetans from Ægina, B.C. 431, vi. 184; ravage of the Megarid by, in the Peloponnesian war, vi. 185; irritation of, at their losses from the plague and the Peloponnesians, vi. 222; energetic demonstration of, B.C. 428, vi. 312; their feeling and conduct towards the revolted Mitylenæans, vi. 337 *seq.*, 346 *seq.*; and Lacedæmonians at Pylus, armistice between, vi. 439; demands of, in return for the release of the Lacedæmonians in Sphakteria, vi. 445; and Bœotians, debate between, after the battle of Delium, B.C. 424, vi. 534 *seq.*; discontent of, with Sparta, on the non-fulfilment of the peace of Nikias, vii. 12; re-capture of Skiônê by, vii. 31; and Amphipolis, vii. 142, xi. 304, 328 *seq.*; siege and capture of Mêlos by, vii. 148 *seq.*; treatment of Alkibiadês by, for his alleged profanation of the mysteries, vii. 288 *seq.*; victory of, near the Olympieion at Syracuse, vii. 299 *seq.*; forbearance of, towards Nikias, vii. 306 *seq.*; not responsible for the failure of the Sicilian expedition, B.C. 415, vii. 306 *n.*; defeat of, at Epipolæ, B.C. 414, vii. 373; conduct of, on receiving Nikias's despatch, B.C. 414, vii. 383, 386 *seq.*; victory of, in the harbour of Syracuse, B.C. 413, vii. 399; and Syracusans, conflicts between, in the Great Harbour, vii. 404, 409 *seq.*, 434 *seq.*, 445 *seq.*; postponement of their retreat from Syracuse by an eclipse of the moon, vii. 432; blockade of, in the harbour of Syracuse, vii. 439 *seq.*, 454 *seq.*; and Corinthians near Naupaktus, vii. 492 *seq.*; resolutions of, after the disaster at Syracuse, vii. 497 *seq.*; suspicions of, about Chios, vii. 507; defeat Alkamenês and the Peloponnesian fleet, vii. 508; effect of the Chian revolt on, vii. 514; harassing operations of, against Chios, B.C. 412, vii. 529 *seq.*, 537, 540; victory of, near Milêtus, B.C. 412, vii. 529, 531; retirement of, from Milêtus, B.C. 412, vii. 533; naval defeat of, near Eretria, B.C. 411, viii. 97 *seq.*; moderation of, on the deposition of the Thirty and the Four Hundred, viii. 121 *seq.*, 411 *seq.*; victory of, at Kyzikus, viii. 163; convention of, with Pharnabazus, about Chalkêdon, viii. 179; capture of Byzantium by, viii. 181; different behaviour of, towards Alkibiadês and Nikias, viii. 215; victories of, at Arginusæ, viii. 231 *seq.*; remorse of, after the death of the generals at Arginusæ, viii. 278; first proposals of, to Sparta after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 308; repayment of the Lacedæmonians by, after the restoration of the democracy, B.C. 403, viii. 417; their treatment of Dorieus, ix. 377 *seq.*; restoration of the Long Walls at Corinth by, ix. 470; and Evagoras of Cyprus, ix. 506, 520; successes of Antalkidas against, ix. 533; their alleged envy of distinguished generals, x. 146 *n.* 3; and Alexander of Pheræ, x. 388; project of, to seize Corinth, B.C. 366, x. 396; and Charidemus in the Chersonese, B.C. 360–358, x. 519 *seq.*; the alliance of Olynthus rejected by, B.C. 358, xi. 331; their remissness in assisting Methônê, xi. 364; change in the character of, between B.C. 431 and 360, xi. 390; prompt resistance of, to Philip at Thermopylæ, xi. 413; expedition of, to Olynthus, B.C. 349, xi. 482; capture of, at Olynthus, xi. 507, 516; letters of Philip to, xi. 568, 575, 576; and the Phokians at Thermopylæ, B.C. 347–346, xi. 578 *seq.*; letter of Philip to, declaring war, B.C. 340, xi. 630 *seq.*; refusal of, to take part in the Amphiktyonic proceedings against Amphissa, xi. 661; Philip asks the Thebans to assist in attacking, xi. 668 *seq.*; and Thebans, war of, against Philip in Phokis, xi. 681, 683 *seq.*; and Philip, peace of Demades between, xi. 699 *seq.*; their recognition of Philip as head of Greece, xi. 700, 705 *seq.*; captured at the Granicus, xii. 141; champions of the liberation of Greece, B.C. 323, xii. 419; helpless condition of, B.C. 302–301, xii. 519.

Athens, historical, impersonal authority of law in, ii. 111; treatment of homicide in, ii. 129 *seq.*; military classification at, ii. 619; meagre history of, before Drako, iii. 65; tribunals for homicide at, iii. 103; local superstitions at, about trial of homicide, iii. 107; pestilence and suffering at, after the Kylonian massacre, iii. 115; and Megara, war between, about Salamis, iii. 123 *seq.*; acquisition of Salamis by, iii. 124 *seq.*; state of, immediately before the

legislation of Solon, iii. 127 *seq.*; rights of property sacred at, iii. 144, 153 *seq.*; rate of interest free at, iii. 152; political rights of Solon's four classes at, iii. 162 *seq.*; democracy at, begins with Kleisthenês, iii. 171; distinction between the democracy at, and Solon's constitution, iii. 176; Solon's departure from, iii. 199; Solon's return to, iii. 207; connexion of, with Thracian Chersonesus, under Peisistratus, iv. 156 *seq.*; after the expulsion of Hippias, iv. 169; introduction of universal admissibility to office at, iv. 195; necessity for creating a constitutional morality at, in the time of Kleisthenês, iv. 206; application of, for alliance with Persia, iv. 222; and Platæa, first connexion between, iv. 223; successes of, against Bœotians and Chalkidians, iv. 228; war of Ægina against, iv. 232, 427; application of Aristagoras to, iv. 389; treatment of Darius's herald at, iv. 427; traitors at, B.C. 490, iv. 475, 482; penal procedure at, iv. 494 *n.*; and Ægina, war between, from B.C. 488 to 481, v. 65, 67 *seq.*, 73, 80, 450; first growth of the naval force of, v. 69; fleet of, the salvation of Greece, v. 73; and Sparta, no heralds sent from Xerxes to, v. 78; Pan-Hellenic congress convened by, at the Isthmus of Corinth, v. 78 *seq.*; and Ægina, occupation of, by Xerxes, v. 154, 158 *seq.*; Mardonius at, v. 204 *seq.*; first step to the separate ascendency of, over Asiatic Greeks, v. 269; conduct of, in the repulse of the Persians, v. 328; Long Walls at, v. 331 *seq.*, 440 *seq.*, ix. 447 *seq.*; plans of Themistoklês for the naval aggrandisement of, v. 337 *seq.*; increase of metics and commerce at, after the enlargement of Piræus, v. 341; headship of the allied Greeks transferred from Sparta to, v. 348 *seq.*; and Sparta, first open separation between, v. 350 *seq.*, 394; proceedings of, on being made leader of the allied Greeks, v. 356 *seq.*; stimulus to democracy at, from the Persian war, v. 373; changes in the Kleisthenean constitution at, after the Persian war, v. 374 *seq.*; long-sighted ambition imputed to, v. 398; enforcing sanction of the confederacy of Delos exercised by, v. 404; increasing power and unpopularity of, among the allied Greeks, v. 406 *seq.*; as guardian of the Ægean against piracy, between B.C. 476–466, v. 413; bones of Theseus conveyed to, v. 413, 415; quarrel of, with Thasos, B.C. 465; v. 419, 422; first attempt of, to found a city at Ennea Hodoi on the Strymon, v. 421; alliance of, with Megara, B.C. 461, v. 435; growing hatred of Corinth and neighbouring states to, B.C. 461, v. 435; war of, with Corinth, Ægina, &c., B.C. 459, v. 437 *seq.*; reconciliation between leaders and parties at, after the battle of Tanagra, v. 447; acquisition of Bœotia, Phokis, and Lokris by, v. 449; and the Peloponnesians, five years' truce between, v. 453; and Persia, treaty between, B.C. 450, v. 455 *seq.*; fund of the confederacy transferred from Delos to, v. 464; position and prospects of, about B.C. 448, v. 466 *seq.*; commencement of the decline of, v. 463 *seq.*; and Delphi, B.C. 452–447, v. 468; loss of Bœotia by, v. 469 *seq.*; despondency at, after the defeat at Koronêia, v. 474; and Sparta, thirty years' truce between, v. 475; and Megara, feud between, v. 476; magistrates and Areopagus in early, v. 477; increase of democratical sentiment at, between the time of Aristeidês and of Periklês, v. 480; choice of magistrates by lot at, v. 481; oligarchical party at, v. 489; maritime empire of, vi. 2 *seq.*, viii. 384–397, ix. 275 *seq.*; maritime revenue of, vi. 6 *seq.*, 9 *n.* 2, 49; commercial relations of, in the Thirty years' truce, vi. 15; political condition of, between B.C. 445–431, vi. 21 *seq.*; improvements in the city of, under Periklês, vi. 27 *seq.*, 31 *seq.*; Periklês's attempt to convene a Grecian congress at, vi. 34; application of the Samians to Sparta for aid against, vi. 41; funeral ceremony of slain warriors at, vi. 43; and her subject-allies, vi. 45 *seq.*, 65; and Sparta, confederacies of, vi. 66; reinforcement from, to Korkyra against Corinth, vi. 77 *seq.*, 89; and Corinth, after the second naval battle between Corinth and Korkyra, vi. 91 *seq.*; and Perdikkas, vi. 93 *seq.*, 613 *seq.*, vii. 141; non-aggressive, between B.C. 445–431, vi. 103; Megara prohibited from trading with, vi. 104; hostility of the Corinthians to, after their defeat near Potidæa, vi. 106; discussion and decision of the Spartan assembly upon war with, B.C. 431, vi. 109 *seq.*; position and prospects of, on commencing the Peloponnesian war, vi. 128 *seq.*, 151 *seq.*, 154 *seq.*; requisitions addressed to, by Sparta, B.C. 431, vi. 132 *seq.*, 142 *seq.*; assembly at, on war with Sparta, B.C. 431, vi. 145 *seq.*; conduct of, on the Theban night-surprise of Platæa, vi. 161 *seq.*; and the Akarnanians, alliance between, vi. 163; crowding of population into, on Archidamus's invasion of Attica, vi. 175; and Sicily, relations of, altered by the quarrel between Corinth and Korkyra, vi. 176; clamour at, on Archidamus's ravage of Acharnæ, vi. 178; measures for the permanent defence of, B.C. 431, vi. 187 *seq.*; alliance of Sitalkês with, vi. 191, 286 *seq.*; freedom of individual thought and action at, vi. 201 *seq.*; position of, at the time of Periklês's funeral oration, vi. 206; the plague at, vi. 209 *seq.*, 396; proceedings of, on learning the revolt of Mitylênê, vi. 301; exhausted treasury of, B.C. 428, vi. 314; new politicians at, after Periklês, vi. 331 *seq.*; revolutions at, contrasted with those at Korkyra, vi.

382; political clubs at, vi. 392; and the prisoners in Sphakteria, vi. 440 *seq.*, 478 *seq.*, vii. 8 *seq.*; fluctuation of feeling at, as to the Peloponnesian war, vi. 482; and her Thracian subject-allies, vi. 551 *seq.*; and Brasidas's conquests in Thrace, vi. 563; and Sparta, one year's truce between, B.C. 423, vi. 588 *seq.*; and Sparta, relations between, B.C. 423–422, vi. 613, 618 *seq.*; necessity for voluntary accusers at, vi. 664; and Sparta, alliance between, B.C. 421, vii. 6; application of Corinthians to, B.C. 421, vii. 28; Lacedæmonian envoys at, about Panaktum and Pylus, B.C. 420, vii. 40; and Argos, alliance between, B.C. 420, vii. 58 *seq.*; convention of, with Argos, Mantineia, and Elis, B.C. 420, vii. 68 *seq.*; policy of, attempted by Alkibiadês, B.C. 419, vii. 84 *seq.*; attack of, upon Epidaurus, B.C. 419, vii. 87, 90; and Sparta, relations between, B.C. 419, vii. 95; and Argos, renewed alliance between, B.C. 417, vii. 137; and Sparta, relations between, B.C. 416, vii. 140; and the Sicilian expedition, vii. 180, 194, 197 *seq.*, 220 *seq.*, 495 *seq.*; mutilation of the Hermæ at, vii. 227 *seq.*, 267 *seq.*; injurious effects of Alkibiadês's banishment upon, B.C. 415, vii. 295; Nikias's despatch to, for reinforcements, B.C. 414, vii. 376 *seq.*; and Sparta, violation of the peace between, B.C. 414, vii. 392; effects of the Lacedæmonian occupation of Dekeleia on, vii. 487 *seq.*; dismissal of Thracian mercenaries from, vii. 490 *seq.*; revolt of Chios, Erythræ, and Klazomenæ from, B.C. 412, vii. 512; appropriation of the reserve fund at, vii. 514; loss of Teos by, B.C. 412, vii. 516; revolt of Lebedos and Eræ from, B.C. 412, vii. 517; loss and recovery of Lesbos by, B.C. 412, vii. 526 *seq.*; recovery of Klazomenæ by, B.C. 412, vii. 529; rally of, during the year after the disaster at Syracuse, viii. 1; conspiracy of the Four Hundred at, viii. 2, 9 *seq.*, 41 *seq.*; loss of Orôpus by, viii. 34; arrival of the Paralus at, from Samos, viii. 40; constitutional morality of, viii. 56; restoration of democracy at, B.C. 411, viii. 91 *seq.*, 101 *seq.*, 108 *seq.*, 121; contrast between oligarchy at, and democracy at Samos, B.C. 411, viii. 123 *seq.*; revolt of Byzantium from, B.C. 411, viii. 131; revolt of Abydos and Lampsakus from, viii. 127; revolt of Kyzikus from, viii. 151; zeal of Pharnabazus against, viii. 152; proposals of peace from Sparta to, B.C. 410, viii. 165 *seq.*; return of Alkibiadês to, B.C. 407, viii. 196 *seq.*; fruitless attempt of Agis to surprise, B.C. 407, viii. 205; complaints at, against Alkibiadês, B.C. 407, viii. 208 *seq.*; conflicting sentiments at, caused by the battle of Arginusæ, viii. 238; alleged proposals of peace from Sparta to, after the battle of Arginusæ, viii. 286; condition of her dependencies, after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 302 *seq.*; oath of mutual harmony at, after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 306; surrender of, to Lysander, viii. 307 *seq.*; return of oligarchical exiles to, B.C. 404, viii. 315; oligarchical party at, B.C. 404, viii. 318 *seq.*; imprisonment of Strombichidês and other democrats at, B.C. 404, viii. 319; the Thirty tyrants at, viii. 321, 325 *seq.*, ix. 251 *seq.*, 257 *seq.*, 263; Lacedæmonian garrison at, under Kallibius, viii. 329; alteration of feeling in Greece after the capture of, by Lysander, viii. 353, 361, 376; restoration of Thrasybulus and the exiles to, viii. 382; restoration of the democracy at, B.C. 403, viii. 383, 399, 401, 405 *seq.*, 419 *seq.*; condition of, B.C. 405–403, viii. 398; abolition of Hellenotamiæ and restriction of citizenship at, B.C. 403, viii. 423 *seq.*; development of dramatic genius at, between the time of Kleisthenês and of Eukleidês, viii. 434 *seq.*, 445 *seq.*; accessibility of the theatre at, viii. 438; growth of rhetoric and philosophy at, viii. 462 *seq.*; literary and philosophical antipathy at, viii. 476; enlargement of the field of education at, viii. 477; sophists at, viii. 479 *seq.*, 543; banishment of Xenophon from, ix. 241; Theban application to, for aid against Sparta, B.C. 395, ix. 404 *seq.*; alliance of Thebes, Corinth, Argos and, against Sparta, ix. 419; contrast between political conflicts at, and at Corinth, ix. 460 *n.* 2; alarm at, on the Lacedæmonian capture of the Long Walls at Corinth, ix. 473; and Ægina, B.C. 389, ix. 516 *seq.*; financial condition of, from B.C. 403 to 387, ix. 525 *seq.*; creation of the Theôric Board at, ix. 526; property-taxes at, ix. 528 *n.*; and the peace of Antalkidas, x. 2, 16; applications of, to Persia, B.C. 413, x. 9, 11; and Evagoras, x. 24 *seq.*; naval competition of, with Sparta, after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 56 *seq.*; and Macedonia, contrast between, x. 63; Theban exiles at, after the seizure of the Kadmeia by Phœbidas, x. 82, 109 *seq.*; condemnation of the generals at, who had favoured the enterprise of Pelopidas, x. 130; contrast between judicial procedure at, and at Sparta, x. 138; hostility of, to Sparta, and alliance with Thebes, B.C. 378, x. 138; exertions of, to form a new maritime confederacy, B.C. 378, x. 139 *seq.*; absence of Athenian generals from, x. 146 *n.* 3; synod of new confederates at, B.C. 378, x. 151; nature and duration of the Solonian census at, x. 153 *seq.*; new census at, in the archonship of Nausinikus, x. 155 *seq.*; symmories at, x. 158 *seq.*; financial difficulties of, B.C. 374, x. 180; displeasure of, against Thebes, B.C. 374, x. 181, 214; separate peace of, with the Lacedæmonians, B.C. 374, x. 186, 192; disposition of, towards peace with Sparta,

B.C. 372, x. 214, 222; and the dealings of Thebes with Platæa and Thespiæ, B.C. 372, x. 219 *seq.*; and the peace of, B.C. 371, x. 226, 232; and Sparta, difference between in passive endurance and active energy, x. 255; the Theban victory at Leuktra not well received at, x. 257; at the head of a new Peloponnesian land confederacy, B.C. 371, x. 274; application of Arcadians to, for aid against Sparta, B.C. 370, x. 290; application of Sparta, Corinth, and Phlius to, for aid against Thebes, B.C. 369, x. 320 *seq.*; ambitious views of, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 334 *seq.*; and Sparta, alliance between, B.C. 369, x. 346; embassies from, to Persia, x. 381, 383, 401; loss of Oropus by, B.C. 366, x. 392; alliance of, with Arcadia, B.C. 366, x. 394; partial readmission of, to the Chersonese, B.C. 365, x. 405 *seq.*; and Kotys, x. 408 *seq.*, 512, 514; Theban naval operations against, under Epaminondas, x. 415 *seq.*; naval operations of Alexander of Pheræ against, x. 509; and Miltokythes, x. 512; restoration of the Chersonese to, B.C. 358, x. 522; transmarine empire of, B.C. 358, x. 524; condition of, B.C. 360–359, xi. 282; proceedings of Philip towards, on his accession, xi. 300; and Eubœa, xi. 306 *seq.*, 474 *seq.*; surrender of the Chersonese to, B.C. 358, xi. 309; revolt of Chios, Kos, Rhodes, and Byzantium from, B.C. 358, xi. 310 *seq.*, 325; armaments and operations of, in the Hellespont, B.C. 357, xi. 316; loss of power to, from the Social War, xi. 326; Philip's hostilities against, B.C. 358–356, xi. 333; recovery of Sestos by, B.C. 353, xi. 361; intrigues of Kersobleptes and Philip against, B.C. 353, xi. 362; countenance of the Phokians by, B.C. 353, xi. 367; applications of Sparta and Megalopolis to, B.C. 353, xi. 368, 405; alarm about Persia at, B.C. 354, xi. 398; Philip's naval operations against, B.C. 351, xi. 424 *seq.*; and Olynthus, xi. 455, 462, 467, 482 *seq.*, 507, 516; and Philip, overtures for peace between, B.C. 348, xi. 511 *seq.*; application of the Phokians to, for aid against Philip at Thermopylæ, xi. 522 *seq.*; embassies to Philip from, xi. 526 *seq.*, 556 *seq.*, 583, 594 *seq.*; resolution of the synod of allies at, respecting Philip, xi. 538; assemblies at, in the presence of the Macedonian envoys, xi. 541 *seq.*; envoys from Philip to, xi. 535, 537, 541, 551, 555; motion of Philokrates for peace and alliance between Philip and, xi. 541 *seq.*; ratification of peace and alliance between Philip and, xi. 549 *seq.*, 593 *seq.*; alarm and displeasure at, on the surrender of Thermopylæ to Philip, xi. 584; professions of Philip to, after his conquest of Thermopylæ, xi. 586; and the honours conferred upon Philip by the Amphiktyons, xi. 592; and Philip, formal peace between, from B.C. 346 to 340, xi. 611; mission of Python from Philip to, xi. 616; and Philip, proposed amendments in the peace of, B.C. 646, between, xi. 616 *seq.*; and Philip, disputes between, about the Bosporus and Hellespont, xi. 623; increased influence of Demosthenes at, B.C. 341–338, xi. 625; services of Kallias the Chalkidian to, B.C. 341, xi. 626; and Philip, declaration of war between, B.C. 340, xi. 629 *seq.*; votes of thanks from Byzantium and the Chersonese to, xi. 637; accusation of the Amphissians against, at the Amphiktyonic assembly, B.C. 339, xi. 650 *seq.*; and Thebes, unfriendly relations between, B.C. 339, xi. 669; proceedings at, on Philip's fortification of Elateia and application to Thebes for aid, xi. 670 *seq.*, 679; and Thebes, alliance of, against Philip, B.C. 339, xi. 677; Demosthenes crowned at, xi. 681, 685; proceedings at, on the defeat at Chæroneia, xi. 693 *seq.*; lenity of Philip towards, after the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 697; means of resistance at, after the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 701; honorary votes at, in favour of Philip, xi. 702; sentiment at, on the death of Philip, xii. 13; submission of, to Alexander, xii. 16; conduct of, on Alexander's violation of the convention at Corinth, xii. 23 *seq.*; proceedings at, on the destruction of Thebes by Alexander, xii. 59; Alexander demands the surrender of anti-Macedonian leaders at, xii. 59; pacific policy of, in Alexander's time, xii. 373 *seq.*; position of parties at, during and after the anti-Macedonian struggle of Agis, xii. 335; submission of, to Antipater, xii. 434 *seq.*; state of parties at, on the proclamation of Polysperchon, xii. 465; Kassander gets possession of, xii. 487; under Demetrius Phalereus, xii. 488 *seq.*; census at, under Demetrius Phalereus, xii. 491: Demetrius Poliorketes at, xii. 504 *seq.*, 516, 518 *seq.*, 524; alteration of sentiment at, between B.C. 338 and 307, xii. 508; in B.C. 501 and 307, contrast between, xii. 509; restrictive law against philosophers at, B.C. 307, xii. 512; embassy to Antigonus from, xii. 513; political nullity of, in the generation after Demosthenes, xii. 529; connexion of, with Bosporus or Pantikapæum, xii. 650 *seq.*

Athos, iv. 31; colonies in, iv. 33; Mardonius's fleet destroyed near, iv. 423; Xerxes' canal through, v. 31 *seq.*

Atlas, i. 8, 12, 13.

Atossa, iv. 310.

Atreids, i. 213.

Atreus, i. 219 *seq.*

Atropos, i. 9.

Attalus, the Macedonian, xi. 708; and Pausanias, xi. 711; death of, xi. 715.

Attalus, uncle of Kleopatra, death of, xii. 11.

Attic legends, i. 264 *seq.*; chronology, commencement of, iii. 66; gentes, iii. 73 *seq.*;

demes, iii. 85, 91, 94, iv. 178 *n.*; law of debtor and creditor, iii. 129, 144 *n.*; scale, ratio of, to the Æginæan and Euboic, iii. 230; Dionysia, iv. 94.
Attica, original distribution of, i. 264; division of, by Kekrops, i. 267; obscurity of the civil condition of, before Solon, iii. 67; alleged duodecimal division of, in early times, iii. 68; four Ionic tribes in, iii. 68 *seq.*; original separation and subsequent consolidation of communities in, iii. 92; long continuance of the cantonal feeling in, iii. 93; state of, after Solon's legislation, iii. 207; Spartan expeditions to, against Hippias, iv. 163; Xerxes in, v. 148 *seq.*; Lacedæmonian invasion of, under Pleistoanax, v. 472; Archidamus's invasions of, vi. 172 *seq.*, 208, 299; Lacedæmonian invasion of, B.C. 427, vi. 322; invasion of, by Agis, B.C. 413, vii. 395; king Pausanias's expedition to, viii. 375 *seq.*
Augê, i. 242.
Augeas, i. 189.
Aulis, Greek forces assembled at, against Troy, i. 393 *seq.*; Agesilaus at, ix. 358.
Ausonians, iii. 471.
Autoklês at the congress at Sparta, B.C. 371, x. 223; in the Hellespont, x. 511 *seq.*
Autolykus, i. 163.
Azan, i. 242.

B.

Babylon, iii. 396 *seq.*; Cyrus's capture of, iv. 283 *seq.*; revolt, and reconquest of, by Darius, iv. 310 *seq.*; Alexander at, xii. 228 *seq.*, 334 *seq.*; Harpalus satrap of, xii. 323.
Babylonian scale, ii. 429; kings, their command of human labour, iii. 405.
Babylonians, industry of, iii. 402; deserts and predatory tribes surrounding, iii. 407.
Bacchæ of Euripidês, i. 357 *n.*
Bacchiads, ii. 412, iii. 2.
Bacchic rites, i. 40, 41, 47, 355.
Bacchus, birth of, i. 353; rites of, i. 355.
Bacon and Sokratês, viii. 617 *n.* 2; on the Greek philosophers, viii. 623 *n.* 2.
Bad, meaning of, in early Greek writers, ii. 88; double sense of the Greek and Latin equivalents of, iii. 62 *n.* 2.
Bagœus and Orœtês, iv. 309.
Bagoas, xi. 608, 610, xii. 102, 319.
Baktria, Alexander in, xii. 272, 279, 289 *seq.*
Barbarian, meaning of, ii. 315; and Grecian military feeling, contrast between, vi. 608.
Bards, ancient Grecian, ii. 183, 194.
Bardylis, defeat of, by Philip, xi. 303.
Barka, modern observations of, iv. 44 *n.* 2, 49 *n.* 2, 50 *n.*; foundation of, iv. 57; Persian expedition from Egypt against, iv. 64; capture of, iv. 65; submission of, to Kambysês, iv. 296.
Basilids, iii. 246 *n.* 2, 253.
Batis, governor of Gaza, xii. 195.
Battus, founder of Kyrênê, iv. 40 *seq.*; dynasty of, iv. 54 *seq.*; the Third, iv. 58.
Bebrykians, iii. 281, 282.
Bellerophôn, i. 167 *seq.*
Bêlus, temple of, iii. 398.
Bequest, Solon's law of, iii. 186.
Berœa, Athenian attack upon, vi. 97 *n.* 2.
Bessus, xii. 218 *seq.*, 273, 279.
Bias, i. 122, 150 *seq.*; of Priênê, iv. 279.
Bisaltæ, the king of, iv. 28, v. 59.
Bithynia, Derkyllidas in, ix. 299.
Bithynians, iii. 281.
Boar, the Kalydônian, i. 195, 199 *seq.*
Bœotia, affinities of, with Thessaly, ii. 24; transition from mythical to historical, ii. 25; cities and confederation of, ii. 396; Mardonius in, v. 203, 214; Pausanias's march to, v. 221; supremacy of Thebes in, restored by Sparta, v. 426, 443; expedition of the Lacedæmonians into, B.C. 458, v. 443 *seq.*; acquisition of, by Athens, v. 449; loss of, by Athens, v. 469 *seq.*, 475 *n.*; scheme of Demosthenês and Hippokratês for invading, B.C. 424, vi. 516; and Argos, projected alliance between, B.C. 421, vii. 33 *seq.*; and Sparta, alliance between, B.C. 420, vii. 36; and Eubœa, bridge connecting, viii. 150, 159; Agesilaus on the northern frontier of, ix. 433; expeditions of Kleombrotus to, x. 128 *seq.*, 175; expulsion of the Lacedæmonians from, by the Thebans, B.C. 374, x. 183; proceedings in, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 256; retirement of the Spartans from, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 259; extinction of free cities in, by Thebes, xi. 285; successes of Onomarchus in, xi. 409; reconstitution of, by Alexander, xii. 65.
Bœotian war, ix. 402 *seq.*; cities after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 38, 44.
Bœotians, ii. 21 *seq.*, 393 *seq.*; and Chalkidians, successes of Athens against, iv. 228; and Athenians, debate between, after the battle of Delium, vi. 534 *seq.*; at peace during the One year's truce between Athens and Sparta, vi. 618; repudiate the peace of Nikias, vi. 674, vii. 3; refuse to join Argos, B.C. 421, vii. 22.
Bœôtus, genealogy of, i. 349 *n.*, ii. 25 *n.*
Bogês, v. 401.
Bomilkar, xii. 562 *seq.*, 588.
Boreas, i. 8, 273, 274.
Bosporus, Alkibiades and the Athenian fleet at the, viii. 170; Autokles in the, x. 512; disputes between Philip and Athens about, xi. 623.
Bosporus or Pantikapæum, xii. 648 *seq.*
Bottiæans, iv. 17, 24 *n.*
Boulê, Homeric, ii. 90; and Agora, ii. 104.
Branchidæ and Alexander, xii. 274 *seq.*
Brasidas, first exploit of, vi. 182; and Knêmus, attempt of, upon Peiræus, vi. 284; at Pylus, vi. 434; sent with Helot and other Peloponnesian hoplites to Thrace, vi. 503; at Megara, vi. 511 *seq.*; march of, through Thessaly to Thrace, vi. 542 *seq.*; and Perdikkas, relations between, vi. 545, 600,

604 *seq.*; prevails upon Akanthus to revolt from Athens, vi. 546 *seq.*; proceedings of, at Argilus, vi. 554, 556; at Amphipolis, vi. 554 *seq.*, 638 *seq.*; repelled from Eion, vi. 561; capture of Lékythus by, vi. 578; revolt of Skiônê to, vi. 594 *seq.*; and Perdikkas, proceedings of, towards Arrhibæus, vi. 545, 600, 604 *seq.*; personal ascendency of, vi. 562, 580; operations of, after his acquisition of Amphipolis, vi. 574; surprises and takes Torônê, vi. 576; acquisition of Mendê by, vi. 599; retreat of, before the Illyrians, vi. 606 *seq.*; Lacedæmonian reinforcement to, vi. 614; attempt of, upon Potidæa, vi. 616; opposition of, to peace on the expiration of the One year's truce, vi. 621; death and character of, vi. 645, 646, 653 *seq.*; speech of, at Akanthus, ix. 266 *seq.*; language of, contrasted with the acts of Lysander, ix. 269.

Brazen race, the, i. 89.

Brennus, invasion of Greece by, xii. 527.

Briareus, i. 6.

Bribery, judicial, in Grecian cities, v. 253.

Briséis, i. 399.

Bromias, xi. 416.

Brontés, i. 6.

Brundusium, iii. 524.

Brute, the Trojan, i. 614 *seq.*

Bruttians, xi. 13, 187.

Bryant, hypothesis on the Trojan war, i. 446 *n.* 2; on Palæphatus, i. 561 *n.*

Bryas, vii. 134.

Budini, iii. 329.

Bukephalia, xii. 308, 313.

Bull, Phalaris's brazen, v. 277 *n.*

Bura, destruction of, x. 212.

Butadæ, i. 271.

Byblus, surrender of, to Alexander, xii. 176.

Byzantium, iv. 36; extension of the Ionic revolt to, iv. 393; Pausanias at, v. 343, 364; revolt of, from Athens, B.C. 411, viii. 131; Klearchus, the Lacedæmonian, sent to, viii. 173; capture of, by the Athenians, viii. 181; mission of Cheirisophus to, ix. 169; return of Cheirisophus from, ix. 197; the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 211 *seq.*; revolt of, from Athens, B.C. 358, xi. 310 *seq.*, 325; mission of Demosthenes to, xi. 627; siege of, by Philip, xi. 635; vote of thanks from, to Athens, xi. 637; Philip concludes peace with, xi. 638.

C.

Calabrian peninsula, Dionysius's projected wall across, xi. 60.

Calycé, i. 188.

Campanians, xi. 12; of Ætna, x. 693.

Canacé, i. 186 *n.*

Carthage, iii. 365; foundation and dominion of, iii. 461 *seq.*; and Tyre, amicable relations of, iii. 465; projected expedition of Kambysês against, iv. 207; empire, power, and population of, x. 539 *seq.*; and her colonies, x. 544; military force of, x. 546 *seq.*; political constitution of, x. 548 *seq.*; oligarchical system and sentiment at, x. 550 *seq.*; powerful families at, x. 552; intervention of, in Sicily, B.C. 410, x. 553 *seq.*; and Dionysius, x. 652, 658, 670, 672; distress at, on the failure of Imilkon's expedition against Syracuse, x. 713; danger of, from her revolted Libyan subjects, B.C. 394, x. 714; Dionysius renews the war with, xi. 56 *seq.*; Dionysius concludes an unfavourable peace with, xi. 58; new war of Dionysius with, xi. 61; danger from, to Syracuse, B.C. 344, xi. 189; operations of Agathokles on the eastern coast of, xii. 567 *seq.*; sedition of Bomilkar at, xii. 588.

Carthaginian invasion of Sicily, B.C. 480, v. 297 *seq.*; fleet, entrance of, into the Great Harbour of Syracuse, x. 695.

Carthaginians, and Phenicians, difference between the aims of, iii. 370; and Greeks, first known collision between, iii. 465; peace of, with Gelo, after the battle of the Himera, v. 302; and Egestæans, victory of, over the Selinuntines, x. 557; blockade and capture of Agrigentum by, x. 588 *seq.*; plunder of Syracuse by, x. 671; in Sicily, expedition of Dionysius against, x. 673 *seq.*; naval victory of, off Katana, x. 690; before Syracuse, x. 695 *seq.*, 706 *seq.*; defeat of, in the Great Harbour of Syracuse, x. 698; in Sicily, frequency of pestilence among, xi. 1; purchase the robe of the Lakinian Hêrê, xi. 31; and Hipponium, xi. 59; invade Sicily, B.C. 340, xi. 241, 242; Timoleon's victory over, at the Krimêsus, xi. 246 *seq.*; peace of Timoleon with, xi. 258; their defence of Agrigentum against Agathokles, xii. 549 *seq.*; victory of, over Agathokles at the Himera, xii. 551 *seq.*; recover great part of Sicily from Agathokles, xii. 553; expedition of Agathokles to Africa against, xii. 554 *seq.*; religious terror of, after the defeat of Hanno and Bomilkar, xii. 565; success of, against Agathokles in Numidia, xii. 577; victories of, over Archagathus, xii. 593; Archagathus blocked up at Tunês by, xii. 593, 597; victory of, over Agathokles near Tunês, xii. 598; nocturnal panic in the camp of, near Tunês, xii. 598; the army of Agathokles capitulate with, after his desertion, xii. 600.

Caspian Gates, xii. 247 *n.* 2.

Castes, Egyptian, iii. 421 *seq.*

Catalogue in the Iliad, i. 393 *seq.*, ii. 210.

Cato the elder, and Kleon, vi. 662 *n.*, 664 *n.*

Census, nature and duration of the Solonian, x. 153 *seq.*; in the archonship of Nausinikus, x. 155 *seq.*

Centaur Nessus, i. 206.

Centimanes, i. 11.

Ceremonies, religious, a source of mythes, i. 85, 86.

Cestus, iv. 78 *n.* 2.

Chabrias, conduct of, at Naxos, viii. 285; defeat of Gorgôpas by, ix. 520; proceedings of, between B.C. 387–378, x. 145; at Thebes, x. 172; victory of, near Naxos, x. 176 *seq.*; at Corinth, x. 352; in Egypt, x. 498, 499; and Charidemus, x. 522; death of, xi. 316.
Chæreas, viii. 40, 62.
Chæroneia, victory of the Thebans over Onomarchus at, xi. 361; battle of, B.C. 338, xi. 687 *seq.*
Chaldæan priests and Alexander, xii. 336, 342.
Chaldæans, iii. 391 *seq.*
Chalkêdon and Alkibiadês, viii. 170, 178.
Chalkideus, expedition of, to Chios, vii. 506, 509 *seq.*; and Tissaphernes, treaty between, vii. 518; defeat and death of, vii. 529.
Chalkidians, Thracian, iv. 29 *seq.*, vi. 259, 502; of Eubœa, successes of Athens against, iv. 228.
Chalkidikê, success of Timotheus in, x. 411; three expeditions from Athens to, B.C. 349–348, xi. 467 *n.*, 487; success of Philip in, xi. 488 *seq.*, 505.
Chalkis, iii. 220 *seq.*; retirement of the Greek fleet to, on the loss of three triremes, v. 111.
Chalybes, iii. 340, ix. 146 *seq.*, 150.
Champions, select, change in Grecian opinions respecting, ii. 607.
Chaonians, iii. 555 *seq.*
Chaos, i. 5; and her offspring, i. 6.
Chares, assistance of, to Phlius, x. 372; recall of, from Corinth, x. 393; unsuccessful attempt of, to seize Corinth, x. 396; in the Chersonese, B.C. 358, x. 522; at Chios, xi. 315; in the Hellespont, xi. 316; accusation of Iphikrates and Timotheus by, xi. 318 *seq.*; and Artabazus, xi. 324; conquest of Sestos by, xi. 361; expedition of, to Olynthus, xi. 487; at the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 693; capitulation of, at Mitylênê, xii. 192.
Charidemus, x. 344; and Iphikrates, x. 409; and Timotheus, x. 411, 413; and Kephisodotus, x. 515, 519; and Kersobleptes, x. 518, 521, 522; and the Athenians in the Chersonese, B.C. 360–358, x. 519 *seq.*; and Miltokythes, x. 520; his popularity and expedition to Thrace, xi. 429; expedition of, to Chalkidikê, xi. 487; put to death by Darius, xii. 145.
Charidemus and Ephialtes, banishment of, xii. 62.
Charikles, expedition of, to Peloponnesus, B.C. 413, vii. 396; and Peisander, vii. 270.
Charilaus and Lykurgus, ii. 464; the Samian, iv. 336.
Charites, the, i. 13.
Charitesia, festival of, i. 175.
Charlemagne, legends of, i. 635.
Charmandê, dispute among the Cyreian forces near, ix. 46.
Charminus, victory of Astyochus over, vii. 547.
Charon the Theban, x. 112 *seq.*
Charondas, iv. 562.
Charopinus, iv. 391.
Cheirisophus, ix. 108; and Xenophon, ix. 125, 131, 145 *seq.*; at the Kentritês, ix. 137; mission of, to Byzantium, ix. 169; return of, from Byzantium, ix. 197; elected sole general of the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 199; death of, ix. 202.
Chersonese, Thracian, iv. 36; connexion of, with Athens under Peisistratus, iv. 156 *seq.*; attacked by the Athenians, B.C. 479, v. 270; operations of Periklês in, vi. 14; retirement of Alkibiadês to, B.C. 407, viii. 216; fortification of, by Derkyllidas, ix. 302; partial readmission of Athenians to, B.C. 365, x. 405 *seq.*; Epaminondas near, x. 413, 419; Timotheus at, x. 413, 419, 507; Ergophilus in the, x. 508 *seq.*; Kotys in the, x. 514; Kephisodotus in the, x. 515; Charidemus and the Athenians in the, x. 519 *seq.*; restoration of, to Athens, B.C. 358, x. 522, xi. 309; Kersobleptes cedes part of, to Athens, xi. 362; speech of Demosthenes on, xi. 624; mission of Demosthenes to, xi. 627; votes of thanks from, to Atheus, xi. 637.
Chians at Ladê, iv. 411; activity of, in promoting revolt among the Athenian allies, vii. 516; expedition of, against Lesbos, vii. 526 *seq.*; improved condition of, B.C. 411, viii. 127.
Chimæra, the, i. 10.
Chios, foundation of, iii. 252; Histiæus at, iv. 402; an autonomous ally of Athens, vi. 2; proceeding of Athenians at, B.C. 425, vi. 490; application from, to Sparta, B.C. 413, vii. 502; the Lacedæmonians persuaded by Alkibiadês to send aid to, vii. 505; suspicions of the Athenians about, B.C. 412, vii. 507; expedition of Chalkideus and Alkibiadês to, vii. 509 *seq.*; revolt of, from Atheus, B.C. 412, vii. 511 *seq.*; expedition of Strombichidês to, vii. 515; harassing operations of the Athenians against, B.C. 412, vii. 529 *seq.*, 537, 540; prosperity of, between B.C. 480–412, vii. 530; defeat of Pedaritus at, viii. 26; removal of Mindarus from Milêtus to, viii. 137; voyage of Mindarus from, to the Hellespont, viii. 138, 139 *n.*; revolution at, furthered by Kratesippidas, viii. 190; escape of Eteonikus from Mitylênê to, viii. 237, 256; Eteonikus at, viii. 287; revolt of, from Athens, B.C. 358, xi. 310 *seq.*, 325; repulse of the Athenians at, B.C. 358, xi. 315; acquisition of, by Memnon, xii. 141; capture of, by Macedonian admirals, xii. 192.
Chivalry, romances of, i. 635 *seq.*
Chlidon, x. 114.
Chœrilus, Näke's comments on, ii. 185 *n.*; poem of, on the expedition of Xerxes into Greece, v. 53 *n.*
Choric training at Sparta and Krête, iv. 113 *seq.*
Choriênes, Alexander's capture of the rock of, xii. 289.
Chorus, the Greek, iv. 112; improvements in, by Stesichorus, iv. 119.

Chronicle of Turpin, the, i. 635.
Chronological calculation destroys the religious character of mythical genealogies, i. 597; table from Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, ii. 48 *seq.*; computations, the value of, dependent on the trustworthiness of the genealogies, ii. 5[illegible]; evidence of early poets, ii. 60.
Chronologists, modern, ii. 51.
Chronologizing attempts indicative of mental progress, ii. 78.
Chronology of mythical events, various schemes of, ii. 47 *seq.*; Alexandrine, from the return of the Herakleids to the first Olympiad, ii. 409; of Egyptian kings from Psammetichus to Amasis, iii. 441 *n.* 3; Egyptian, iii. 453 *seq.*; Grecian, between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars, v. 413 *n.* 2; of the period between Philip's fortification of Elateia and the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 683 *n.* 2.
Chrysaor, i. 1, 10.
Chryseis, i. 399.
Chrysippus, i. 219.
Chrysopolis, occupation of, by the Athenians, viii. 171.
Cimmerian invasion of Asia Minor, iii. 336 *seq.*
Cimmerians, iii. 316; driven out of their country by the Scythians, iii. 333 *seq.*
Circé and Æêtês, i. 342.
Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, chronological table from, ii. 48 *seq.*; opinion on the computations of the date of the Trojan war, ii. 52; vindication of the genealogies, ii. 56 *seq.*
Coined money, first introduction of, into Greece, ii. 428.
Comedy, growth, development, and influence of, at Athens, viii. 445 *seq.*
Comic poets, before Aristophanês, viii. 447; writers, mistaken estimate of, as witnesses and critics, viii. 454 *seq.*
Commemorative influence of Grecian rites, i. 610 *seq.*
Congress at Corinth, B.C. 421, vii. 18, 20; at Sparta, B.C. 421, vii. 33; at Mantinea, B.C. 419, vii. 91 *seq.*
Conôn on the legend of Kadmus, i. 351.
Constitutional forms, attachment of the Athenians to, viii. 56; morality, necessity for creating, in the time of Kleisthenês, iv. 206.
Corinth, origin of, i. 164 *seq.*; Dorians at, ii. 12; early distinction of, ii. 153; isthmus of, ii. 297; Herakleid kings of, ii. 411; Dorian settlers at, ii. 415; despots at, iii. 54 *seq.*; great power of, under Periander, iii. 58; Sikyôn and Megara, analogy of, iii. 64; voyage from, to Gadês in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., iii. 374; relations of Korkyra with, iii. 541 *seq.*; and Korkyra, joint settlements of, iii. 544 *seq.*; relations between the colonies of, iii. 549; decision of, respecting the dispute between Thebes and Platæa, iv. 224; protest of, at the first convocation at Sparta, iv. 235; Pan-Hellenic congress at the Isthmus of, v. 78 *seq.*; rush of Peloponnesians to the Isthmus of, after the battle of Thermopylæ, v. 146; growing hatred of, to Athens, B.C. 461, v. 435; operations of the Athenians in the Gulf of, B.C. 455, v. 451; and Korkyra, war between, vi. 68 *seq.*; and Athens, after the naval battle between Corinth and Korkyra, vi. 91 *seq.*; congress at, B.C. 421, vii. 18, 20 *seq.*; and Syracuse, embassy from, to Sparta, vii. 320; synod at, B.C. 412, vii. 506; altered feeling of, after the capture of Athens by Lysander, viii. 354, 361, 376; alliance of, with Thebes, Athens, and Argos, against Sparta, ix. 419; anti-Spartan allies at, ix. 421; battle of, ix. 426 *seq.*, 441; Pharnabazus and the anti-Spartan allies at, ix. 446; philo-Laconian party at, B.C. 392, ix. 457 *seq.*; *coup d'état* of the government at, ix. 459; contrast between political conflicts at, and at Athens, ix. 460 *n.* 2; and Argos, consolidation of, B.C. 392, ix. 462; victory of the Lacedæmonians within the Long Walls at, ix. 463 *seq.*; the Long Walls of, partly pulled down by the Lacedæmonians, ix. 466; the Long Walls of, restored by the Athenians, and taken by Agesilaus and Teleutias, ix. 470 *seq.*; and the peace of Antalkidas, ix. 537, x. 16; application of, to Athens, for aid against Thebes, x. 320 *seq.*; Iphikrates at, x. 325; and the Persian rescript in favour of Thebes, x. 386; project of the Athenians to seize, B.C. 366, x. 396; peace of, with Thebes, B.C. 366, x. 397 *seq.*; application from Syracuse to, B.C. 344, xi. 190; message from Hiketas to, xi. 202; Dionysius the Younger at, xi. 214 *seq.*; reinforcement from, to Timoleon, xi. 215, 219, 222; efforts of, to restore Syracuse, xi. 236, 238; Philip chosen chief of the Greeks at the congress at, xi. 705; convention at, under Alexander, B.C. 336, xii. 17 *seq.*; violations of the convention at, by Alexander, xii. 21 *seq.*; Alexander at, B.C. 335, xii. 64.
Corinthian envoys, speech of, to the Athenian assembly, in reply to the Korkyræans, vi. 82; speech of, to the Spartan assembly, against Athens, vi. 109 *seq.*; speech of, at the congress of allies at Sparta, vi. 125 *seq.*
Corinthian genealogy of Eumelus, i. 104 *seq.*
Corinthian Gulf, naval conflicts of Corinthians and Lacedæmonians in, ix. 454; territory, Nikias's expedition against, vi. 483 *seq.*; war, commencement of, ix. 419.
Corinthians, early commerce and enterprise of, iii. 1; behaviour of, at Salamis, v. 197; defeated by Myronides, v. 439; procure the refusal of the Samians' application to Sparta for aid against Athens, vi. 41, 68; instigate Potidæa, the Chalkidians and Bottiæans to revolt from Athens, vi. 94 *seq.*; defeat of, near Potidæa, vi. 100; strive to excite war against Athens after their defeat near Potidæa, vi. 106; re-

pudiate the peace of Nikias, vi. 674, vii. 3; induce Argos to head a new Peloponnesian alliance, vii. 17; hesitate to join Argos, vii. 22, 84; join Argos, vii. 24; application of, to the Bœotians and Athenians B.C. 421, vii. 27, 28; and Karneia, ii. 411 *n.* 2; and Athenians, naval battle between, near Naupaktus, vii. 492 *seq.*; and Lacedæmonians, naval and land conflicts between, B.C. 393, ix. 454 *seq.*

Courts of Requests, their analogy to Athenian dikasteries, v. 536 *n.* 2.

Creditor and debtor, law of, at Athens before Solon, iii. 129; Roman law of, iii. 215.

Criticisms on the first two volumes of this history, reply to, i. 548 *n.*

Crœsus and Solon, alleged interview between, iii. 201 *seq.*; moral of Herodotus's story about, iii. 206; reign and conquests of, iii. 347 *seq.*; power and alliances of, iv. 246; and Cyrus, war between, iv. 254 *seq.*; and the oracles, iv. 255, 256, 261; solicits the alliance of Sparta, iv. 257; fate of, impressive to the Greek mind, iv. 263.

Cumæ in Campania, iii. 476 *seq.*

Cyclades, ii. 285, iii. 219; Themistoklês levies fines on, v. 192.

Cycle, epic, ii. 164 *seq.*

Cyclic poets, ii. 165 *seq.*

Cyclôpes, i. 6, 7.

Cyprus, influence of Aphroditê upon, i. 7; Solon's visit to, iii. 200; Phenicians and Greeks in, iii. 372; extension of the Ionic revolt to, iv. 393; subjugation of, by Phenicians and Persians, iv. 394; conquest of, by the Turks in 1570, iv. 396 *n.*; expedition to, under Kimon, v. 454; before and under Evagoras, x. 19 *seq.*; subjugation of, to the Persian king Ochus, xi. 605; surrender of the princes of, to Alexander, xii. 186.

Cyrenaica, iv. 49 *n.* 2, 50 *n.*

Cyropædia, Xenophon's, iv. 247.

Cyrus the Great, early history and rise of, iv. 247 *seq.*; and Crœsus, war between, iv. 254 *seq.*; and the Lacedæmonians, iv. 268; conquests of, in Asia, iv. 282; capture of Babylon by, iv. 283 *seq.*; exploits and death of, iv. 290; effects of his conquests upon the Persians, iv. 291 *seq.*; the tomb of, xii. 319.

Cyrus the Younger, arrival of, in Asia Minor, B.C. 408, viii. 184, 187; Lysander's visits to, at Sardis, viii. 190 *seq.*, 289; pay of the Peloponnesian fleet by, viii. 194; and Kallikratidas, viii. 221; entrusts his satrapy and revenues to Lysander, viii. 291; and Artaxerxes Mnemon, viii. 427, ix. 10 *seq.*; youth and education of, ix. 6; his esteem for the Greeks and hopes of the crown, ix. 7; charge of Tissaphernes against, ix. 9; strict administration and prudent behaviour of, ix. 13; forces of, collected at Sardis, ix. 15; march of, from Sardis to Kunaxa, ix. 19 *seq.*; assistance of Epyaxa to, ix. 24; review of his troops at Tyriæum, ix. 24; and Syennesis, ix. 27; at Tarsus, ix. 29 *seq.*; desertion of Xenias and Pasion from, ix. 37; at Thapsakus, ix. 39 *seq.*; in Babylonia, ix. 48 *seq.*; speech of, to his Greek forces in Babylonia, ix. 50; his conception of Grecian superiority, ix. 51; his present to the prophet Silanus, ix. 53; passes the undefended trench, ix. 53; at Kunaxa, ix. 56 *seq*; character of, ix. 65; probable conduct of, towards Greece, if victorious at Kunaxa, ix. 67; and the Asiatic Greeks, ix. 285.

D.

Dædalus, i. 301, 307 *seq.*

Dæmon of Sokratês, viii. 563 *seq.*

Dæmons, i. 88, 91, 95 *seq.*; and gods, distinction between, i. 569 *seq.*; admission of, as partially evil beings, i. 572.

Damascus, capture of, by the Macedonians, xii. 173.

Damasithymus of Kalyndus, v. 184.

Danaë, legend of, i. 123.

Danaos and the Danaides, i. 120.

Dancing, Greek, iv. 114.

Daphnæus, at Agrigentum, x. 590 *seq.*; death of, x. 615.

Dardanus, son of Zeus, i. 387.

Daric, the golden, iv. 322 *n.* 1.

Darius Hystaspês, accession of, iv. 301 *seq.*; discontents of the satraps under, iv. 305 *seq.*; revolt of the Medes against, iv. 306 *n.*; revolt of Babylon against, iv. 310; organization of the Persian empire by, iv. 314 *seq.*; twenty satrapies of, iv. 317 *seq.*; organizing tendency, coinage, ronds, and posts of, iv. 321 *seq.*; and Sylosôn, iv. 335; conquering dispositions of, iv. 340; probable consequences of an expedition by, against Greece before going against Scythia, iv. 350 *seq.*; invasion of Scythia by, iv. 353 *seq*; his orders to the Ionians at the bridge over the Danube, iv. 363; return of, to Susa from Scythia, iv. 378; revenge of, against the Athenians, iv. 401; preparations of, for invading Greece, iv. 425; submission of Greeks to, before the battle of Marathon, iv. 426; heralds of, at Athens and Sparta, iv. 427; instructions of, to Datis and Artaphernês, iv. 444; resolution of, to invade Greece a second time, v. 1; death of, v. 2.

Darius, son of Artaxerxes Mnemon, x. 505.

Darius Codomannus, encouragement of anti-Macedonians in Greece by, xii. 27; his accession and preparations for defence against Alexander, xii. 102; irreparable mischief of Memnon's death to, xii. 143; change in the plan of, after Memnon's death, xii. 144, 147; puts Charidemus to death, xii. 145; Arrian's criticism on the plan of, against Alexander, xii. 148; at Mount Amanus, xii. 155 *seq.*; advances into

Kilikia, xii. 157; at Issus before the battle, xii. 158; defeat of, at Issus, xii. 160 *seq.*; capture of his mother, wife, and family by Alexander, xii. 167, 207; his correspondence with Alexander, xii. 176, 190; inaction of, after the battle of Issus, xii. 206; defeat of, at Arbela, xii. 210 *seq.*; a fugitive in Media, xii. 241, 244; pursued by Alexander into Parthia, xii. 247 *seq.*; conspiracy against, by Bessus and others, xii. 248 *seq.*; death of, xii. 251; Alexander's disappointment in not taking him alive, xii. 252; funeral, fate, and conduct of, xii. 252.

Darius Nothus, ix. 2 *seq.*; death of, ix. 9.

Daskon, attack of Dionysius on the Carthaginian naval station at, x. 709.

Datames, x. 496.

Datis, siege and capture of Eretria by, iv. 417 *seq.*; conquest of Karystus by, iv. 417; Persian armament at Samos under, iv. 444; conquest of Naxos and other Cyclades by, iv. 445 *seq.*; forbearance of, towards Delos, iv. 446; at Marathon, iv. 450, 466 *seq.*; return of, to Asia, after the battle of Marathon, iv. 489.

Debtor and creditor, law of, at Athens before Solon, iii. 129; Roman law of, iii. 215 *seq.*

Debtors, Solon's relief of, iii. 135; treatment of, according to Gallic and Teutonic codes, iii. 149 *n.*

Debts, the obligation of, inviolable at Athens, iii. 144, 153; distinction between the principal and interest of, in an early society, iii. 145.

Defence, means of, superior to those of attack in ancient Greece, ii. 149.

Deianeira, i. 205.

Deinokrates, xii. 549, 550, 595, 603 *seq.*

Déiokes, iii. 308 *seq.*

Deities not included in the twelve great ones, i. 14; of guilds or trades, i. 465.

Dekamnichus, x. 63.

Dekarchies established by Lysander, ix. 255 *seq.*, 272, 277.

Dekeleia, legend of, i. 232; fortification of, by the Lacedæmonians, vii. 393, 395, 486; Agis at, vii. 487, viii. 204.

Delian Apollo, i. 61.

Delian festival, iii. 225 *seq.*; early splendour and subsequent decline of, iv. 73; revival of, B.C. 426, vi. 423.

Delium, Hippokratés's march to, and fortification of, B.C. 424, vi. 518 *seq.*; battle of, B.C. 424, vi. 526 *seq.*; siege and capture of, by the Bœotians, B.C. 424, vi. 539; Sokratés and Alkibiadés at the battle of, vi. 540.

Délos, Ionic festival at, iii. 225 *seq.*, iv. 73; forbearance of Datis towards, iv. 446; the confederacy of, v. 357 *seq.*, 394 *seq.*; the synod of, v. 410, 411; first breach of union in the confederacy of, v. 416; revolt of Thasos from the confederacy of, v. 419; transfer of the fund of the confederacy from, to Athens, v. 464; transition of the confederacy of, into an Athenian empire, v. 464; purification of, by the Athenians, vi. 422; restoration of the native population to, B.C. 421, vii. 31.

Delphi, temple and oracle of, i. 63 *seq.*, ii. 338; oracle of, and the Battiadæ dynasty, iv. 61; early state and site of, iv. 79; growth of, iv. 83; conflagration and rebuilding of the temple at, iv. 161 *seq.*; the oracle at, worked by Kleisthenés, iv. 163; oracle of, and Xerxes's invasion, v. 81 *seq.*; Xerxes's detachment against, v. 156; proceedings of Sparta and Athens at, B.C. 452–447, v. 468; answer of the oracle of, to the Spartans on war with Athens, B.C. 432, vi. 125; reply of the oracle at, about Sokratés, viii. 567 *seq.*; Agesipolis and the oracle at, ix. 494; claim of the Phokians to the presidency of the temple at, xi. 344 *seq.*; Philomelus seizes and fortifies the temple at, xi. 348; Philomelus takes part of the treasures in the temple at, xi. 354; employment of the treasures in the temple at, by Onomarchus, xi. 358; Phayllus despoils the temple at, xi. 415; peculation of the treasures at, xi. 520; miserable death of all concerned in the spoliation of the temple at, xi. 599; relations of the Lokrians of Amphissa with, xi. 649; Amphiktyonic meeting at, B.C. 339, xi. 650 *seq.*

Delphian Apollo, reply of, to the remonstrance of Crœsus, iv. 261.

Delphians and Amphiktyons, attack of, upon Kirrha, xi. 656.

Delphinium at Athens, iii. 108 *n.*

Deluge of Deucalion, i. 133 *seq.*

Demades, reproof of Philip by, xi. 697; peace of, xi. 698 *seq.*; remark of, on hearing of Alexander's death, xii. 346; Macedonizing policy of, xii. 374; and Phokion, embassy of, to Antipater, xii. 434; death of, xii. 456.

Demagogues, iii. 25, 29, viii. 57 *seq.*

Demaratus and Kleomenés, iv. 439 *seq.*; conversations of, with Xerxes, v. 55, 118, 131; advice of, to Xerxes after the death of Leonidas, v. 131.

Demes, Attic, iii. 85, 91, 94, iv. 176 *seq.*

Démêter, i. 8, 9, 13; foreign influence on the worship of, i. 31, 32; how represented in Homer and Hesiod, i. 49; Homeric hymn to, i. 51 *seq.*; legends of, differing from the Homeric hymn, i. 59; Hellenic importance of, i. 60.

Démétrius of Skêpsis, on Ilium, i. 444.

Demetrius Phalereus, administration of, at Athens, xii. 488 *seq.*; retires to Egypt, xii. 505; condemnation of, xii. 511.

Demetrius Poliorketes, at Athens, xii. 504 *seq.*, 516, 518 *seq.*, 524; exploits of, xii. B.C. 307–304, xii. 514; his successes in Greece against Kassander, xii. 516; march of, through Thessaly into Asia, xii. 522; return of, from Asia to Greece, xii. 524; acquires the crown of Macedonia, xii. 525;

Greece under, xii. 526; captivity and death of, xii. 526.
Demiurgi, iii. 96.
Democharès, xii. 511, 513, 520, 529.
Democracies, Grecian, securities against corruption in, vii. 553.
Democracy, Athenian, iii. 171, 187, v. 515; effect of the idea of, upon the minds of the Athenians, iv. 239 *seq.*; at Athens, stimulus to, from the Persian war, v. 373; reconstitution of, at Samos, viii. 64 *seq.*; restoration of, at Athens, B.C. 411, viii. 101 *seq.*, 108 *seq.*, and B.C. 403, viii. 383, 399; moderation of Athenian, viii. 121, 411 *seq.*; at Samos contrasted with the oligarchy of the Four Hundred, viii. 123 *seq.*
Democratical leaders at Athens, and the Thirty, viii. 319, 326 *seq.*; sentiment, increase of, at Athens between B.C. 479–459, v. 480.
Dēmokēdēs, romantic history of, iv. 341 *seq.*
Demônax, reform of Kyrênê by, iv. 58; constitution of, not durable, iv. 66.
Demophantus, psephism of, viii. 109.
Demos at Syracuse, v. 278.
Demosthenês the general, in Akarnania, vi. 401; expedition of, against Ætolia, vi. 401 *seq.*; saves Naupaktus, vi. 408; goes to protect Amphilochian Argos, vi. 409; his victory over Eurylochus at Olpæ, vi. 410 *seq.*; his triumphant return from Akarnania to Athens, vi. 422; fortifies and defends Pylus, vi. 425 *seq.*; application of, for reinforcements from Athens, to attack Sphakteria, vi. 453 *seq.*; victory of, in Sphakteria, vi. 463 *seq.*; attempt of, to surprise Megara and Nisæa, vi. 504 *seq.*; scheme of, for invading Bœotia, B.C. 424, vi. 516; unsuccessful descent upon Bœotia by, vi. 517; his evacuation of the fort at Epidaurus, vii. 131; expedition of, to Sicily, vii. 383, 396, 414; arrival of, at Syracuse, vii. 413, 415; plans of, on arriving at Syracuse, vii. 416; night-attack of, upon Epipolæ, vii. 418 *seq.*; his proposals for removing from Syracuse, vii. 424 *seq.*; and Nikias, resolution of, after the final defeat in the harbour of Syracuse, vii. 454; capture and subsequent treatment of, vii. 468 *seq.*, 477; respect for the memory of, vii. 479; death of, vii. 478.
Demosthenes, father of the orator, xi. 370.
Demosthenes the orator, first appearance of, as public adviser in the Athenian assembly, xi. 368; parentage and early youth of, xi. 369 *seq.*; and his guardians, xi. 371; early rhetorical tendencies of, xi. 372; training and instructors of, xi. 375 *seq.*; action and matter of, xi. 379; first known as a composer of speeches for others, xi. 380; speech of, against Leptines, xi. 380; speech of, on the Symmories, xi. 398 *seq.*; exhortations of, to personal effort and sacrifice, xi. 403, 498; recommendations of, on Sparta and Megalopolis, xi. 406; first Philippic of, xi. 431 *seq.*; opponents of, at Athens, B.C. 351, xi. 443; earliest Olynthiac of, xi. 456 *seq.*; practical effect of his speeches, xi. 460; second Olynthiac of, xi. 462 *seq.*; allusions of, to the Theôric fund, xi. 466–471; third Olynthiac of, xi. 468 *seq.*, 469; insulted by Meidias, xi. 478; reproached for his absence from the battle of Tamynæ, xi. 480; serves as hoplite in Eubœa, and is chosen senator for, B.C. 349–348, xi. 481; order of the Olynthiacs of, xi. 499 *seq.*; and Æschines, on the negotiations with Philip, B.C. 347–346, xi. 515 *n.*, 525 *n.*; speaks in favour of peace, B.C. 347, xi. 517; and the first embassy from Athens to Philip, xi. 527 *seq.*, 536; failure of, in his speech before Philip, xi. 530; and the confederate synod at Athens respecting Philip, xi. 539 *n.*, 541, 544 *n.* 2; and the motion of Philokrates for peace and alliance with Philip, xi. 542 *seq.*; and the exclusion of the Phokians from the peace and alliance between Athens and Philip, xi. 553 *seq.*; and the second embassy from Athens to Philip, xi. 558, 560 *seq.*, 570, 574; and the third embassy from Athens to Philip, xi. 583; charges of, against Æschines, xi. 595; and the peace and alliance of Athens with Philip, B.C. 346, xi. 597; recommends acquiescence in the Amphiktyonic dignity of Philip, xi. 602; vigilance and warnings of, against Philip, after B.C. 346, xi. 614; speech on the Chersonese and third Philippic of, xi. 624; increased influence of, at Athens, B.C. 341–338, xi. 625; mission of, to the Chersonese and Byzantium, xi. 627; vote of thanks to, at Athens, xi. 638; reform in the administration of the Athenian marine by, xi. 639 *seq.*, 642 *n.*; his opposition to the proceedings of Æschines at the Amphiktyonic meeting, B.C. 339, xi. 661; on the special Amphiktyonic meeting at Thermopylæ, xi. 663; advice of, on hearing of the fortification of Elateia by Philip, xi. 672; mission of, to Thebes, B.C. 339, xi. 674 *seq.*; crowned at Athens, xi. 681, 685; at the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 687 *seq.*, 692; confidence shown to, after the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 694, 703; conduct of, on the death of Philip, xii. 13; correspondence of, with Persia, xii. 27 *seq.*; accusation against, respecting the revolt of Thebes against Alexander, xii. 70; position and policy of, in Alexander's time, xii. 375 *seq.*; and Æschines, judicial contest between, xii. 385 *seq.*; accusation against, in the affair of Harpalus, xii. 396 *seq.*; recall of, from exile, xii. 422; flight of, to Kalauria, xii. 434; condemnation and death of, xii. 439 *seq.*; life and character of, xii. 442 *seq.*
Derdas at Olynthus, x. 88.

Derkyllidas, in Asia, ix. 288 *seq.*, 303 *seq.*, 353; at Abydos and Sestos, ix. 444; superseded by Anaxibius at Abydos, ix. 512.
Despots, in Greece, iii. 5, 25 *seq.*; at Sikyôn, iii. 43 *seq.*, 51; at Corinth, iii. 54 *seq.*; of Asiatic Greece, deposition of, by Aristagoras, iv. 384; Sicilian, v. 279, 317.
Deukalión, i. 132 *seq.*
Dexippus, ix. 171, 204 *seq.*, x. 585, 594, 614.
Diadochi, Asia Hellenised by, xii. 362.
Diagoras, prosecution of, vii. 284.
Dialectics, Grecian, iv. 129, viii. 465, 473 *seq.*, 622 *seq.*
Dictators in Greece, iii. 26.
Dido, legend of, iii. 463.
Digamma and the Homeric poems, ii. 197.
Diitrephés, vii. 450 *seq.*
Dikæus, vision of, v. 161.
Dikasteries not established by Solon, iii. 167; Athenian, iv. 188 *seq.*, v. 521 *seq.*, 539, 546; constitution of, by Periklês, v. 481 *seq.*, 496; working of, at Athens, v. 516 *seq.*; at Rhodes and other Grecian cities, v. 519 *n.* 2; jurisdiction of, over the subject-allies of Athens, vi. 51 *seq.*, 58, 59, 62.
Dikasts, oath of, at Athens, iii. 144, viii. 409; Athenian, iv. 189, 502; under Periklês, v. 483, 496, 512 *seq.*, 532.
Dikon of Kaulonia, xi. 39.
Dimnus, xii. 259, 263.
Diodórus, his historical versions of mythes, i. 555; statement of, respecting the generals at Arginusæ, viii. 250.
Diodotus, speech of, vi. 343 *seq.*
Diogenes and Alexander, xii. 64.
Diokleidés, vii. 271, 278.
Dioklés the Corinthian, ii. 398.
Dioklés the Syracusan, the laws of, x. 537 *seq.*; aid to Himera under x. 566, 569; banishment of, x. 577.
Dio Chrysostom's attempt to historicise the legend of Troy, i. 435.
Dio Chrysostom at Olbia, xii. 646 *seq.*
Diomédés, return of, from Troy, i. 421.
Diomedon, pursuit of Chians by, vii. 517; at Teos and Lesbos, vii. 526; at Milêtus and Chios, vii. 529 *seq.*; at Samos, viii. 38; defeat of, by Kallikratidas, viii. 230.
Dion, his Dionysian connexion, and character, xi. 76; Plato, and the Pythagoreans, xi. 78 *seq.*; political views of, xi. 81 *seq.*; maintains the confidence of Dionysius the Elder to the last, xi. 84; his visits to Peloponnesus and Athens, xi. 85; conduct of, on the accession of Dionysius the Younger, xi. 88 *seq.*; efforts of, to improve Dionysius the Younger, xi. 92 *seq.*; entreats Plato to visit Dionysius the Younger, xi. 95; and Plato urge Dionysius the Younger to reform himself, xi. 101; and Plato, intrigues of Philistus against, xi. 105; alienation of Dionysius the Younger from, xi. 107; banishment of, xi. 108; property of, confiscated by Dionysius the Younger, xi. 113; resolution of, to avenge himself on Dionysius the Younger, and free Syracuse, xi. 114 *seq.*, 118; forces of, at Zakynthus, xi. 116, 121; expedition of, against Dionysius the Younger, xi. 118 *seq.*; entry of, into Syracuse, B.C. 357, xi. 128 *seq.*; chosen general by the Syracusans, xi. 131; captures Epipolæ and Euryalus, xi. 132; blockade of Ortygia by, xi. 133, 137, 160; negotiations of Dionysius the Younger with, xi. 134, 145; victory of, over Dionysius the Younger, xi. 135 *seq.*; intrigues of Dionysius the Younger against, xi. 140, 143; suspicions of the Syracusans against, xi. 140, 144, 166; and Herakleides, xi. 141, 146, 157, 161 *seq.*, 170, 171; deposition and retreat of, from Syracuse, xi. 147; at Leontini, xi. 148, 151, 152; repulse of Nypsius and rescue of Syracuse by, xi. 151 *seq.*; entry of, into Syracuse, B.C. 356, xi. 154; entry of, into Ortygia, xi. 164; conduct of, on his final triumph, xi. 165 *seq.*; his omission to grant freedom to Syracuse, xi. 167 *seq.*; opposition to, as dictator, xi. 170 *seq.*; tyranny, unpopularity and disquietude of, xi. 171 *seq.*; death and character of, xi. 173 *seq.*; and Timoleon, contrast between, xi. 276 *seq.*
Dionysia, Attic, i. 41, iv. 94.
Dionysiac festival at Athens, B.C. 349, xi. 478.
Dionysius, Phókæan, iv. 407 *seq.*, 412.
Dionysius the Elder, and Konon, ix. 453; demonstration against, at Olympia, B.C. 384, x. 101 *seq.*, xi. 37 *seq.*; triremes of, captured by Iphikrates, x. 204; first appearance of, at Syracuse, x. 581; movement of the Hermokratean party to elevate, x. 598; harangue of, against the Syracusan generals at Agrigentum, x. 600 *seq.*; one of the generals of Syracuse, x. 602 *seq.*; first expedition of, to Gela, x. 606; accusations of, against his colleagues, x. 608; election of, as sole general, x. 609; stratagem of, to obtain a body-guard, x. 610 *seq.*; establishes himself as despot at Syracuse, x. 615 *seq.*, 630; second expedition of, to Gela, x. 620 *seq.*; charges of treachery against, x. 625, 633; mutiny of the Syracusan horsemen against, x. 626 *seq.*; and Imilkon, peace between, x. 631 *seq.*; sympathy of Sparta with, x. 634, 705; strong position of, after his peace with Imilkon, x. 635; fortification and occupation of Ortygia by, x. 636 *seq.*; re-distribution of property by, x. 637 *seq.*; exorbitant exactions of, x. 640; mutiny of the Syracusan soldiers against, x. 641 *seq.*; besieged in Ortygia, x. 642 *seq.*; strengthens his despotism, x. 647 *seq.*; conquers Ætna, Naxus, Katana, and Leontini, x. 649; at Enna, x. 650; resolution of, to make war upon Carthage, B.C. 400, x. 652; additional fortifications at Syracuse by, x. 655 *seq.*; preparations of, for war with Carthage, B.C. 399–397, x. 658, 664 *seq.*; improved behaviour of, to the

Syracusans, B.C. 399, x. 658; conciliatory policy of, towards the Greek cities near the Strait of Messênê, B.C. 399, x. 660 *seq.*; marriage of, with Doris and Aristomachê, x. 663, 669; exhorts the Syracusan assembly to war against Carthage, x. 670; permits the plunder of the Carthaginians in Syracuse, x. 671; declares war against Carthage, B.C. 397, x. 672; marches against the Carthaginians in Sicily, B.C. 397, x. 673 *seq.*; osiege and capture of Motyê by, x. 675 *seq.*; revolt of the Sikels from, x. 688; provisions of, for the defence of Syracuse against the Carthaginians, B.C. 396, x. 688; naval defeat of, near Katana, x. 690; retreat of, from Katana to Syracuse, B.C. 395, x. 693; Syracusan naval victory over the Carthaginians in the absence of, x. 698; speech of Theodôrus against, x 699 *seq.*; discontent of the Syracusans with, B.C. 395, x. 699 *seq.*; and Pharakidas, x. 703; attacks the Carthaginian camp before Syracuse and sacrifices his mercenaries, x. 708; success of, by sea and land against the Carthaginians before Syracuse, x. 709; secret treaty of, with Imilkon before Syracuse, x. 712; and the Iberians, x. 713; capture of Libyans by, x. 713; difficulties of, from his mercenaries, xi. 2; re-establishment of Messênê by, xi. 4; conquests of, in the interior of Sicily, B.C. 394, xi. 5; at Tauromenium, xi. 6, 11; and the Sikels, B.C. 394–393, xi. 7, 8; declaration of Agrigentum against, B.C. 393, xi. 8; victory of, near Abakæna, xi. 8; expedition of, against Rhegium, B.C. 393, xi. 9; repulses Magon at Agyrium, xi. 10; plans of, against the Greek cities in Southern Italy, xi. 11; alliance of, with the Lucanians against the Italiot Greeks, xi. 14; attack of, upon Rhegium, B.C. 390, xi. 15; expedition of, against the Italiot Greeks, B.C. 389, xi. 19 *seq.*; his capture and generous treatment of Italiot Greeks, xi. 20; besieges and grants peace to Rhegium, xi. 22; capture of Kaulonia and Hipponium by, xi. 23; capture of Rhegium by, xi. 24, 25, 29; cruelty of, to Phyton, xi. 26; and Sparta, ascendency of, B.C. 387, xi. 30; capture of Kroton by, xi. 31; schemes of, for conquests in Epirus and Illyria, xi. 32; plunders Latium, Etruria, and the temple of Agylla, xi. 34; poetical compositions of, xi. 35; dislike and dread of, in Greece, xi. 35, 42; harshness of, to Plato, xi. 53; new constructions and improvements by, at Syracuse, B.C. 387–383, xi. 54; renews the war with Carthage, B.C. 383, xi. 56 *seq.*; disadvantageous peace of, with Carthage, B.C. 383, xi. 58; projected wall of, across the Calabrian peninsula, xi. 60; relations of, with Central Greece, B.C. 382–369, xi. 60; war of, with Carthage, B.C. 368, xi. 61; gains the tragedy prize at the Lenæan festival at Athens, xi. 63; death and character of, xi. 63 *seq.*, 86; family left by, xi. 75, 86; the good opinion of, enjoyed by Dion to the last, xi. 84; drunken habits of his descendants, xi. 186.

Dionysius the Younger, age of, at his father's death, xi. 76 *n.* 1; accession and character of, xi. 89; Dion's efforts to improve, xi. 92 *seq.*; Plato's visits to, xi. 95 *seq.*, 111 *seq.*; Plato's injudicious treatment of, xi. 100 *seq.*; his hatred and injuries to Dion, xi. 107, 108, 113 *seq.*; detention of Plato by, xi. 110; Dion's expedition against, xi. 118 *seq.*; weakness and drunken habits of, xi. 121; absence of, from Syracuse, B.C. 357, xi. 124; negotiations of, with Dion and the Syracusans, xi. 133, 145; defeat of, by Dion, xi. 135 *seq.*; blockaded in Ortygia by Dion, xi. 137; intrigues of, against Dion, xi. 140, 143; his flight to Lokri, xi. 145; return of, to Syracuse, xi. 186; at Lokri, xi. 187; his surrender of Ortygia to Timoleon, xi. 212; at Corinth, xi. 214 *seq.*

Dionysius of the Pontic Herakleia, xii. 629 *seq.*

Dionysus, worship of, i. 31, 32, 40, 44; legend of, in the Homeric hymn to, i. 46; alteration of the primitive Grecian idea of, i. 47 *seq.*

Diopeithes, xi. 623.

Dioskuri, i. 234.

Diphilus at Naupaktus, B.C. 413, vii. 493.

Diphridas, in Asia, ix. 504.

Dirkê, i. 358.

Discussion, growth of, among the Greeks, iv. 129.

Dithyramb, iv. 118.

Dôdôna, i. 533 *seq.*

Doloneia, ii. 253, 268.

Dolonkians and Miltiadês the first, iv. 157.

Dorian cities in Peloponnesus about 450 B.C., ii. 402; islands in the Ægean and the Dorians in Argolis, ii. 433; immigration to Peloponnesus, ii. 408; settlers at Argos and Corinth, ii. 414 *seq.*, 419; settlement in Sparta, ii. 441; allotment of land at Sparta, ii. 561; mode, the, ii. 583, iii. 288; states, inhabitants of, iii. 43; tribes at Sikyôn, names of, iii. 45, 50.

Dorians, early accounts of, i. 140 *seq.*, ii. 2; mythical title of, to the Peloponnêsus, ii. 8; their occupation of Argos, Sparta, Messenia, and Corinth, ii. 11, 12; early Krêtan, ii. 417; in Argolis and the Dorian islands in the Ægean, ii. 433; of Sparta and Stenyklêrus, ii. 509 *seq.*; divided into three tribes, ii. 486; Messenian, ii. 590; Asiatic, iii. 273, 274; of Ægina, iv. 232.

Doric dialect, ii. 451 *seq.*, iv. 117; emigrations, ii. 35 *seq.*

Dorieus the Spartan prince, aid of, to Kinyps, iv. 53; and the Krotoniates, iv. 556, 559; Sicily, v. 279.

Dorieus, the Rhodian, vii. 542, viii. 156, 157;

capture and liberation of, viii. 217; treatment of, by the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, ix. 377 *seq.*; and Hermokrates in the Ægean, x. 531.
Doris, i. 140, ii. 387.
Doris, wife of Dionysius, x. 663, 669.
Doriskus, Xerxes at, v. 43 *seq.*
Dorkis, v. 348, 350.
Dôrus, i. 136 *seq.*
Drako and his laws, iii. 102 *seq.*
Dramatic genius, development of, at Athens, viii. 434 *seq.*
Drangiana, Alexander in, xii. 258 *seq.*, 270.
Drepanê, i. 327.
Dryopians, settlements of, formed by sea, ii. 417.
Dryopis, ii. 387.
Duketius, the Sikel prince, iii. 500, vii. 167 *seq.*
Dymanes, Hylleis, and Pamphyli, ii. 486.
Dyrrachium, iii. 547 *seq.*

E.

Earliest Greeks, residences of, ii. 146 *seq.*
Early poets, historical value of, ii. 60.
Echemus, i. 130, 244.
Echidna, i. 10.
Eclipse of the sun in a battle between Medes and Lydians, iii. 313; of the moon, B.C. 413, vii. 432; of the moon, B.C. 331, xii. 205.
Edda, the, i. 640.
Edessa, the dynasty of, iv. 21, 23.
Eetioneia, fort at, viii. 79, 86; viii. 93.
Egesta, application of, to Athens, vii. 196 *seq.*; application of, to Carthage, x. 553 *seq.*; Syracusan attack upon, x. 682; barbarities of Agathokles at, xii. 602.
Egypt, influence of, upon the religion of Greece, i. 32, 38, 42; the opening of, to Grecian commerce, i. 492; ante-Hellenic colonies from, to Greece not probable, ii. 357; Solon's visit to, iii. 200; Herodotus's account of, iii. 412 *seq.*; antiquity of, iii. 416; peculiar physical and moral features of, iii. 417; large town-population in, iii. 426; profound submission of the people in, iii. 428, 429; worship of animals in, iii. 430; relations of, with Assyria, iii. 433; archæology and chronology of, iii. 453 *seq.*; and Kyrênê, iv. 56; Persian expedition from, against Barka, iv. 64; Kambyses's invasion and conquest of, iv. 295; revolt and reconquest of, under Xerxes, v. 3; defeat and losses of the Athenians in, v. 45; unavailing efforts of Persia to reconquer, x. 17; Agesilaus and Chabrias in, x. 498 *seq.*; reconquest of, by Ochus, xi. 607; march of Alexander towards, xii. 191, 193, 197; Alexander in, xii. 198 *seq.*
Egyptians, ethnography of, iii. 356; contrasted with Greeks, Phenicians, and Assyrians, iii. 407; and Ethiopians, iii. 419; effect of, on the Greek mind, iii. 458.
Eileithyia, i. 13.
Eion, capture of, by Kimôn, v. 399 *seq.*; defended by Thucydidês against Brasidas, vi. 560; Kleon at, vi. 633.
Ekbatana, foundation of, iii. 309; Darius at, xii. 244; Alexander at, xii. 245 *seq.*, 331 *seq.*; Parmenio at, xii. 245, 265 *seq.*
Ekdikus, expedition of, to Rhodes, ix. 505.
Ekklesia, Athenian, iv. 186.
Elæa, iii. 258.
Elæus, escape of the Athenian squadron from Sestos to, viii. 142; Mindarus and Thrasyllus at, viii. 146, 152.
Elateia, refortification of, by Philip, xi. 667.
Elatus, i. 242.
Elea, Phôkæan colony at, iv. 278; vii. 173.
Eleatic school, viii. 467 *seq.*, 507.
Elegiac verse of Kallinus, Tyrtæus, and Mimnermus, iv. 110.
Eleian genealogy, i. 188, 193.
Eleians excluded from the Isthmian games, i. 191; and the Olympic games, ii. 13, 427; and Pisatans, ii. 585, 591; their exclusion of the Lacedæmonians from the Olympic festival, vii. 77 *seq.*; desert the Argeian allies, vii. 103; and Arcadians, x. 430 *seq.*, 444; exclusion of, from the Olympic festival, B.C. 364, x. 436 *seq.*
Elektra and Thaumas, progeny of, i. 10.
Elektryôn, death of, i. 126.
Eleusinian mysteries, i. 50, 55, 58; alleged profanation of, by Alkibiadês and others, vii. 239 *seq.*, 282 *seq.*; celebration of, protected by Alkibiades, viii. 203.
Eleusinians, seizure and execution of, by the Thirty at Athens, viii. 364.
Eleusis, temple of, i. 53; importance of mysteries to, i. 58; early independence of, iii. 95; retirement of the Thirty to, viii. 371; capture of, viii. 383.
Eleutheria, institution of, at Platæa, v. 256.
Elis, genealogy of, i. 188, 193; Oxylus and the Ætolians at, ii. 13; Pisa, Triphylia, and Lepreum, ii. 591, 592; formation of the city of, v. 427; revolt of, from Sparta to Argos, vii. 24 *seq.*; and Lepreum, vii. 24; and Sparta, war between, ix. 310 *seq.*; claim of, to Triphylia and the Pisatid, x. 356 *seq.*, 429; alienation of, from the Arcadians, x. 356; alliance of, with Sparta and Achaia, x. 429.
Elymi, iii. 468.
Emigrants to Iônia, the, ii. 33 *seq.*
Emigration, early, from Greece, iii. 467.
Emigrations consequent on the Dorian occupation of Peloponnesus, ii. 16; Æolic, Ionic, and Doric, ii. 26 *seq.*
Empedoklês, i. 569 *seq.*, vii. 174, viii. 465.
Emporiæ, xii. 616.
Endius, viii. 165 *seq.*
Endymiôn, stories of, i. 188.
Eneti, the, i. 431.
England, her government of her dependencies compared with the Athenian empire, vi. 66 *n.*
Enienes, ii. 383.
Enna, Dionysius at, x. 650.

Ennea Hodoi, v. 221, vi. 18.
Enômoties, ii. 615 *seq.*
Entella, Syracusan attack upon, x. 682, 693.
Eos, i. 8,
Epaminondas, and the conspiracy against the philo-Laconian oligarchy at Thebes, x. 112, 119, 168 *seq.*; training and character of, x. 163 *seq.*; and Pelopidas, x. 163; and Kallistratus, x. 221, 395; and Agesilaus at the congress at Sparta, x. 226 *seq.*, 238; at Leuktra, x. 242; and Orchomenus, x. 264; proceedings and views of, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 291 *seq.*; expeditions of, into Peloponnesus, x. 294 *seq.*, x. 348 *seq.*, 364 *seq.*, 451 *seq.*; foundation of Megalopolis and Messênê by, x. 306 *seq.*; his retirement from Peloponnesus, x. 319; his trial of accountability, x. 327 *seq.*; mildness of, x. 354; and the Theban expedition to Thessaly, to rescue Pelopidas, x. 388, 390; mission of, to Arcadia, x. 395; Theban fleet and naval expedition under, x. 415 *seq.*; and Menekleidas, x. 367, 417 *seq.*; and the destruction of Orchomenus, x. 428; and the arrest of Arcadians by the Theban harmost at Tegea, x. 447 *seq.*; attempted surprise of Mantinea by the cavalry of, x. 456 *seq.*; at the battle of Mantinea, x. 460 *seq.*; death of, x. 474 *seq.*; character of, x. 483 *seq.*
Epeians, i. 189, 192 *seq.*, ii. 16.
Epeius of Panopeus, i. 410, 422.
Epeunaktæ, iii. 519.
Ephesus, iii. 243 *seq.*; capture of, by Crœsus, iii. 351; defeat of Thrasyllus at, viii. 174; Lysander at, viii. 207, 288; capture of, by Alexander, xii. 121.
Ephetæ, iii. 103, 106 *seq.*
Ephialtês, the Aloïd, i. 186.
Ephialtês, the general, xii. 62, 128, 131.
Ephialtês, the statesman, v. 493, 500; and Periklês, constitution of dikasteries by, v. 481 *seq.*; judicial reform of, v. 496.
Ephors, Spartan, ii. 468, 471 *seq.*, 478, vii. 32; appointment of, at Athens, viii. 319.
Ephorus, i. 550, ii. 497.
Epic cycle, ii. 164 *seq.*
Epic poems, lost, ii. 162; recited in public, not read in private, ii. 182; variations in the mode of reciting, ii. 188 *seq.*; long, besides the Iliad and Odyssey, ii. 209.
Epic poetry in early Greece, ii. 158 *seq.*
Epic poets and their dates, ii. 164.
Epic of the middle ages, i. 643.
Epical localities, transposition of, i. 338; age preceding the lyrical, iv. 100.
Epicharmus, i. 507 *n.*
Epidamnus, iii. 547 *seq.*; and the Illyrians, iv. 7 *seq.*; foundation of, vi. 70; application of the democracy at, to Korkyra and Corinth, vi. 71; attacked by the Korkyræans, vi. 72; expeditions from Corinth to, vi. 72.
Epidaurus, attack of Argos and Athens upon, vii. 87, 90; ravaged by the Argeians, vii. 94; Lacedæmonian movements in support of, vii. 94; attempts of the Argeians to storm, vii. 96; operations of the Argeian allies near, vii. 122; evacuation of the fort at, vii. 131.
Epigoni, the, i. 378, 379, ii. 174 *n.* 2.
Epimenides, visit of, to Athens, i. 37.
Epimenides, of Krete, iii. 115 *seq.*
Epimêtheus, i. 8, 102.
Epipolæ, vii. 334; intended occupation of, by the Syracusans, vii. 337; occupation of, by the Athenians, vii. 338; defeat of the Athenians at, vii. 373; Demosthenês's night-attack upon, vii. 418 *seq.*; capture of, by Dion, xi. 132; capture of, by Timoleon, xi. 226.
Epirots, ii. 311, iii. 470, 555 *seq.*; attack of, upon Akarnania, vi. 233 *seq.*
Epirus, discouraging to Grecian colonisation, iii. 561; Dionysius's schemes of conquest in, xi. 32; government of Olympias in, xii. 533 *n.* 3.
Epistatês, iv. 185.
Epitadas, vi. 453, 463 *seq.*, 470.
Epitadeus, the Ephor, ii. 547.
Epôdus, introduction of, iv. 119.
Epyaxa, and Cyrus the Younger, ix. 24.
Eræ, revolt of, from Athens, vii. 517.
Erasinidês, trial and imprisonment of, viii. 244.
Eratosthenês, viii. 338, 371, 401.
Erechtheion, restoration of, vi. 30.
Erechtheus, i. 262 *seq.*, 271, 278.
Eresus, Thrasyllus at, viii. 137.
Eretria, iii. 220 *seq.*, 228 *seq.*; assistance of, to the Milesians, iv. 391; siege and capture of, by Datis, iv. 447 *seq.*; fate of captives taken by Datis at, iv. 489; naval defeat of the Athenians near, viii. 97 *seq.*; Phokion at, xi. 474 *seq.*; Philippising faction at, xi. 622; liberation of, xi. 626.
Ergoklês, ix. 510 *n.* 2.
Ergophilus, x. 508 *seq.*
Erichthonius, i. 263, 269, 387.
Eriphylê, i. 369 *seq.*
Erôs, i. 5; and Aphrodite, function of, i. 7.
Erytheia, i. 339.
Erythræ, iii. 252, vii. 512.
Eryx, defeat of Dionysius at, xi. 62.
Eryxô and Learchus, iv. 58.
Eteoklês, i. 175, 364, 380.
Eteonikus, expulsion of, from Thasos, viii. 172; at Mitylênê, viii. 231; escape of, from Mitylênê to Chios, viii. 237, 256; at Chios, viii. 287; removal of, from Chios to Ephesus, viii. 289; in Ægina, ix. 516, 521.
Ethiopians and Egyptians, iii. 440.
Etruria, plunder of, by Dionysius, xi. 34.
Euæphnus and Polycharês, ii. 573.
Eubœa, iii. 220 *seq.*; resolution of Greeks to oppose Xerxes at the strait on the north of, v. 98; advance of the Persian fleet to, v. 141; revolt and reconquest of, by Periklês, v. 472; application from, to Agis, vii. 502; revolt of, from Athens, B.C. 411, viii. 99; Peloponnesian fleet sum-

moned from, by Mindarus, viii. 149; bridge joining Bœotia and, viii. 150, 159; rescued from Thebes by Athens, B.C. 358, xi. 306 *seq.*; revolt of, from Athens, B.C. 350–349, xi. 473 *seq.*; intrigues of Philip in, xi. 473; expedition of Phokion to, B.C. 342, xi. 475 *seq.*; hostilities in, B.C. 349–348, xi. 481; Philippizing factions in, B.C. 342, xi. 621; expedition of Phokion to, B.C. 341, xi. 626.
Eubœa in Sicily, v. 290.
Euboic scale, ii. 428, 436, iii. 230.
Euboic synod, xi. 626.
Eubulus, xi. 387, 430, 508, 511, 516.
Eudamidas, x. 78, 88.
Euémerus's treatment of mythes, i. 552.
Euénus, i. 236.
Eukleidés, archonship of, viii. 383, 422.
Euklés, vi. 558, 560, 564 *seq.*
Eumachus, xii. 592, 593.
Eumélus of Bosporus, xii. 654 *seq.*
Eumélus, the poet, i. 164 *seq.*
Eumenes, xii. 99; and Hephæstion, xii. 331; and Perdikkas, xii. 431; victory of, over Kraterus and Neoptolemus, xii. 452 *seq.*; attempts of, to uphold Alexander's dynasty in Asia, xii. 459 *seq.*; and Antigonus, xii. 455.
Eumenides, Æschylus's, and the Areopagus, iii. 108 *n.*
Eumolpus, i. 275 *seq.*
Eunomus, ix. 519.
Eupatridæ, iii. 96 *seq.*
Euphaés, ii. 573.
Euphémus, speech of, at Kamarina, vii. 314.
Euphilétus and Melétus, vii. 277.
Euphræus, xi. 292, 621.
Euphrates, Cyrus the Younger at, ix. 42; the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 141; Alexander at, xii. 204, 337.
Euphron, x. 368 *seq.*
Euripides, faults imputed to, i. 520 *seq.*; story about the dramas of, and the Athenian prisoners in Sicily, vii. 476; number of tragedies by, viii. 437 *n.*; Æschylus and Sophokles, viii. 441 *seq.*; and Dekamnichus, x. 63.
Euripides, financial proposal of, ix. 528 *n.*
Euripus, bridge across, viii. 150, 159.
Eurôpa, i. 299 *seq.*, 350.
Eurotas, crossed by Epaminondas, x. 298.
Euryalus, Hamilkar's attempt on, xii. 572.
Eurybatés, v. 68.
Eurybiadés, v. 109, 167 *seq.*
Eurydikê, widow of Amyntas, x. 342, 343.
Eurydikê, granddaughter of Philip, xii. 449, 450, 455.
Euryleon, v. 280.
Eurylochus, vi. 407, 408, 410, 411.
Eurymedon, victories of the, v. 417.
Eurymedon at Korkyra, vi. 372 *seq.*; and Sophokles, expedition of, to Korkyra and Sicily, vi. 424 *seq.*, 486 *seq.*; at Pylus, vi. 435 *seq.*, 450; expeditions of, to Sicily, vii. 182, 186, 383; return of, from Sicily to Athens, vii. 190.
Eurynomê and Zeus, offspring of, i. 13.
Eurypylus, i. 409.
Eurystheus, i. 127, 129, 130, 219.
Eurytos, i. 190, 206.
Eurytus, v. 129.
Eutœa, Agesilaus at, B.C. 370, x. 288.
Euthydemus, Plato's, viii. 540 *n.*
Euthykrates and Lasthenes, xi. 489, 490.
Euxine, Greek settlements on, iii. 318; iv. 37, ix. 164; first sight of, by the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 152; indigenous tribes on, ix. 165; the Greeks on, and the Ten Thousand, ix. 166 *seq.*; Xenophon's idea of founding a new city on the, ix. 179 *seq.*
Evadné, i. 377.
Evagoras, ix. 506, 520, x. 18 *seq.*

F.

Family tie, in legendary Greece, ii. 112; rites in Greece, iii. 77.
Fates, i. 9; and Crœsus, iv. 264 *seq.*
Ferdousi, Persian epic of, i. 641.
Festivals, Grecian, i. 70, ii. 304, iv. 72, 91 *seq.*, 95 *seq.*; at Athens, viii. 444.
Fiction, plausible, i. 583; ii. 70.
Fictitious matter in Greek tradition, i. 581.
Financial changes, Kleisthenean, iv. 184.
Five Thousand, the, at Athens, viii. 49, 73 *n.*, 83, 102 *n.* 2, 105 *seq.*
Flaying alive by Persians and Turks, iv. 396 *n.*
Fleece, Golden, legend of, i. 169.
Flute, use of, in Sparta, iv. 111.
Fortification of towns in early Greece, ii. 145 *seq.*; of the Grecian camp in the Iliad, ii. 251.
Four Hundred, the oligarchy of, viii. 46 *seq.*
Frenzy, religious, of women, i. 39 *seq.*
Funeral ceremony at Athens over slain warriors, vi. 43; orations, besides that of Periklês, vi. 193 *n.*; obsequies of Hephæstion, xii. 339, 342.
Funerals, Solon's regulations about, iii. 189.

G.

Gadês, iii. 365 *seq.*; voyage from Corinth to, in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., iii. 374.
Gæa, i. 6, 9, 12.
Gœsylus, xi. 163.
Games, Olympic, i. 137, ii. 321 *seq.*, 426 *seq.*, iv. 74 *seq.*; Isthmian, i. 170, ii. 411 *n.* 2, iv. 88; the four great Grecian, ii. 321, iv. 90, 95 *seq.*; Solon's rewards to victors at, iii. 191; Pythian, iv. 79, 86 *seq.*; Nemean, iv. 88.
Gamori, iii. 40; at Syracuse, v. 278.
Ganymédés, i. 387.
Gargaphia, fountain of, v. 224 *n.* 2.
Gaugamela, battle of, xii. 210 *seq.*
Gauls, embassy of, to Alexander, xii. 35; invasion of Greece by, xii. 527.
Gaza, capture of, by Alexander, xii. 193 *seq.*

Gedrosia, Alexander in, xii. 270, 317.
Gela, iii. 419; and Syracuse, before B.C. 500, v. 276; Kleander of, v. 281; Gelo, despot of, v. 288 *seq.*; congress of Sicilian cities at, vii. 187; and Hannibal's capture of Selinus, x. 561; expeditions of Dionysius to, x. 606, 608, 620 *seq.*; capture of, by Imilkon, x. 620 *seq.*; Timoleon and the fresh colonization of, xi. 264; Agathoklês at, xii. 551.
Gelcontes, iii. 69.
Gelo, v. 91, 281–306.
Gelôni, iii. 330.
Gelonian dynasty, fall of, v. 316; citizens of Syracuse, v. 317 *seq.*
Genealogies, Grecian, i. 110 *seq.*, 600; Argeian, i. 113; mythical, i. 260, 596 *seq.*; Egyptian, i. 600; Clinton's vindication of, ii. 56 *seq.*
Genealogy, Corinthian, of Eumêlus, i. 164 *seq.*; of Orchomenos i. 178 *seq.*; Eleian, i. 188; Ætolian, i. 193; Laconian, i. 230; Messênian, i. 235; Arcadian, i. 238.
Generals, Kleisthenean, iv. 182.
Gentes, Attic, iii. 73 *seq.*, iii. 88 *seq.*; analogy between those of Greece and other nations, iii. 81 *seq.*; Grecian, patronymic names of, iii. 84; difference between Grecian and Roman, iii. 87; non-members of, under Solon, iii. 178.
Geographical knowledge, Hesiodic and Homeric, ii. 153; views of Alexander, xii. 312 *n.* 1.
Geography, fabulous, i. 334 *seq.*; Homeric, iii. 276; of the retreat of the Ten Thousand, ix. 157 *seq.*
Geological features of Greece, ii. 287.
Geomori, iii. 40, 96.
Gergis, iii. 267; Derkyllidas at, ix. 296.
Gergithes, iii. 267.
German progress brought about by violent external influences, i. 621; mythes, i. 622.
Gerontes, ii. 90.
Geronthræ, conquest of, ii. 564.
Geryôn, i. 10, 339.
Getæ, Alexander's defeat of, xii. 32.
Giyantes, birth of, i. 7, 12 *n.*
Gillus, iv. 348.
Giskon, x. 553, 556 *n.*, xi. 254.
Glaukæ, xii. 309.
Glaukê, i. 161.
Glaukon, discourse of, in Plato's Republic, viii. 539.
Glaukus, i. 306.
Gnomic, Greek poets, iv. 122 *seq.*
Gnomon, whence obtained by the Greeks, iii. 461.
Goddesses, and Gods, twelve great, i. 14.
Gods, Grecian, how conceived by the Greeks, i. 4 *seq.*, 469 *seq.*; and dæmons, i. 569 *seq.*; and men, i. 601.
Golden Fleece, legend of, i. 169.
Golden race, the, i. 88.
Gongylus, the Corinthian, vii. 363, 372.
Good, &c., meaning of, in early Greek writers, ii. 88; double sense of the Greek and Latin equivalents of, iii. 62 *n.* 2.
Gordian knot, Alexander cuts the, xii. 110.
Gordium, Alexander's march from, xii. 149.
Gordius, legend of, iii. 294.
Gorgias of Leontini, vii. 174, 180, viii. 507, 526.
Gorgons, i. 124.
Gorgôpas at Ægina, ix. 518 *seq.*
Government of historical and legendary Greece, i. 82 *seq.*; heroic, ii. 102; earliest changes of, in Greece, iii. 6 *seq.*; kingly, iii. 10 *seq.*; change from monarchical to oligarchical in Greece, iii. 21 *seq.*
Governments, Grecian, weakness of, iv. 204.
Graces, the, i. 13.
Græcæ, i. 10.
Græci, ii. 359.
Græcia Magna, iii. 534.
Græco-Asiatic cities, xii. 364.
Granikus, battle of the, xii. 107 *seq.*; Athenians captured at the, xii. 141.
Graphê Paranomôn, v. 507 *seq.*; abolition of, B.C. 411, viii. 48.
Grecian mythes, i. 71, 614 *seq.*; genealogies, i. 110 *seq.*; mythology, sources of our information on, i. 146; intellect, expansive force of, i. 487; progress between B.C. 700 and 500, i. 492 *seq.*; antiquity, i. 596, 597, 601; genealogies, i. 600; townsman, intellectual acquisitions of a, i. 613; poetry, matchless, i. 620; progress self-operated, i. 620; mythology, how it would have been affected by the introduction of Christianity, B.C. 500, i. 626; mythes, proper treatment of, i. 651 *seq.*; computation of time, ii. 155 *n.* 2; festivals, intellectual influence of, ii. 304; history, first and second periods of, ii. 362 *seq.*, iv. 70; opinion, change in, on the decision of disputes by champions, ii. 607; states, growing communion of, between B.C. 600 and 547, ii. 621; "faith," iii. 155; settlements on the Euxine, iii. 318; marine and commerce, growth of, iii. 457; colonies in Southern Italy, iii. 501 *seq.*; world about 560 B.C., iii. 533; history, want of unity in, iv. 68, 70; games, influence of, upon the Greek mind, iv. 95 *seq.*; art, beginnings and importance of, iv. 132 *seq.*; architecture, iv. 134; governments, weakness of, iv. 204; world, in the Thirty years' truce, vi. 66; and barbarian military feeling, contrast between, vi. 608; youth, society and conversation of, vii. 46 *n.*; states, complicated relations among, B.C. 420, vii. 70, and B.C. 366, x. 400; philosophy, negative side of, viii. 471; dialectics, their many-sided handling of subjects, viii. 622 *seq.*; states, embassies from, at Pella, B.C. 346, xi. 560 *seq.*; captives, mutilated, at Persepolis, xii. 234; history, bearing of Alexander's Asiatic campaigns on, xii. 242 *seq.*; mercenaries under Darius, xii. 248, 249, 255, 256; envoys with Darius, xii. 256; world, state of, B.C. 334, xii. 370;

exiles, Alexander's rescript directing the recall of, xii. 416 *seq.*

Greece, legends of, originally isolated, afterwards thrown into series, i. 145; legendary and historical, state of society and manners in, ii. 82–159; subterranean course of rivers in, ii. 292; difficulty of land communication in, ii. 294; accessibility of, by sea, ii. 295; islands and colonies of, ii. 298; difference between the land-states and sea-states in, ii. 300; effects of the configuration of, ii. 301 *seq.*; mineral and other productions of, ii. 305 *seq.*; climate of, ii. 309; difference between the inhabitants of different parts of, ii. 310; ante-Hellenic inhabitants of, ii. 350; discontinuance of kingship in, iii. 10; anti-monarchical sentiment of, iii. 15 *seq.*, iv. 236; the voyage from, to Italy or Sicily, iii. 483; seven wise men of, iv. 126 *seq.*; first advance of, towards systematic conjunction, iv. 234; probable consequences of a Persian expedition against, before that against Scythia, iv. 350 *seq.*; on the eve of Xerxes's invasion, v. 77, 80; first separation of, into two distinct parties, v. 350 *seq.*, 394; proceedings in central, between B.C. 470–464, v. 424; state of feeling in, between B.C. 445–431, vi. 103; bad morality of the rich and great in, vi. 383; atmospherical disturbances in, B.C. 427, vi. 396; warlike preparations in, during the winter of B.C. 414–413, vii. 394; alteration of feeling in, after the capture of Athens by Lysander, viii. 353, 361, 376; disgust in, at the Thirty at Athens, viii. 357; degradation of, by the peace of Antalkidas, x. 3 *seq.*, 13; effect of the battle of Leuktra on, x. 250, 252, 263; relations of Dionysius with, B.C. 382–369, xi. 60; state of, B.C. 360–359, xi. 279; decline of citizen-soldiership and increase of mercenaries in, after the Peloponnesian war, xi. 390 *seq.*; effect of the peace and alliance between Philip and Athens upon, xi. 593; movements and intrigues of Philip throughout, after B.C. 346, xi. 612 *seq.*; state of, on Alexander's accession, xii. 1, 12 *seq.*; march of Alexander into, B.C. 336, xii. 15; Macedonian interventions in, B.C. 336–335, xii. 21 *seq.*; terror in, on the destruction of Thebes by Alexander, xii. 58; connexion of Alexander with, history of, xii. 67 *seq.*, 242 *seq.*; an appendage to Macedonia under Alexander, xii. 71; military changes in, during the sixty years before Alexander's accession, xii. 72 *seq.*; possibility of emancipating, during Alexander's earlier Asiatic campaigns, xii. 371; hopes raised in, by the Persian fleet and armies, B.C. 334–331, xii. 372; submission of, to Antipater, xii. 383; effect of Alexander's death on, xii. 419; confederacy for liberating, after Alexander's death, xii. 419 *seq.*; Ptolemy of Egypt in, xii. 504; success of Demetrius Poliorketes in, against Kassander, xii. 516; under Demetrius Poliorketes and Antigonus Gonatas, xii. 526; invasion of, by the Gauls, xii. 527; of Polybius, xii. 528.

Greece, Proper, geography of, ii. 281 *seq.*

Greek forces against Troy, i. 393 *seq.*; language and the mythes, i. 474; tradition, matter of, uncertified, i. 580; language, various dialects of, ii. 318; alphabet, origin of, iii. 459 *n.*; Latin and Oscan languages, iii. 473; settlements, east of the Strymôn in Thrace, iv. 33; settlements on the Euxine south of the Danube, iv. 37; settlements in Libya, and the nomads, iv. 50; cities, local festivals in, iv. 72, 91 *seq.*; lyric poetry, iv. 99, 125; poetry about the middle of the seventh century B.C., iv. 101; music, about the middle of the seventh century B.C., iv. 102; poetry, after Terpander, iv. 104; hexameter, new metres superadded to, iv. 106; chorus, iv. 112, 119; dancing, iv. 114; mind, positive tendencies of, in the time of Herodotus, iv. 141 *n.*; philosophy, in the sixth century B.C., iv. 513 *seq.*; fleet at Artemisium, v. 109 *seq.*, 114 *seq*; fleet at Salamis, v. 152; fleet at Mykalê, v. 259 *seq.*; fleet after the battle of Mykalê, v. 270 *seq.*; fleet, expedition of, against Asia, B.C. 478, v. 343; generals and captains, slaughter of Cyreian, ix. 93 *seq.*; heroes, analogy of Alexander to the, xii. 95.

Greeks, return of, from Troy, i. 418 *seq.*; their love of antiquities, i. 470; their distaste for a real history of the past, i. 481; Homeric, ii. 131, 157; in Asia Minor, ii. 313, iii. 290; extra-Peloponnesian north of Attica in the first two centuries, ii. 363 *seq.*; advance of, in government in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., iii. 27; musical modes of, iii. 288; and Phenicians in Sicily and Cyprus, iii. 372; contrasted with Egyptians, Assyrians, and Phenicians, iii. 407; influence of Phenicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians on, iii. 458 *seq.*; and Carthaginians, first known collision between, iii. 465; Sicilian and Italian, monetary and statical scale of, iii. 494; in Sicily, prosperity of, between B.C. 735 & 485, iii. 491 *seq.*; in Sicily and in Greece Proper, difference between, iii. 498; Italian, between B.C. 700–500, iii. 525, 527, 533; their talent for command over barbarians, iv. 22; first voyage of, to Libya, iv. 39; and Libyans at Kyrene, iv. 53; political isolation of, iv. 68; tendencies to political union among, after B.C. 560, iv. 69; growth of union among, between B.C. 776–560, iv. 71; rise of philosophy and dialectics among, iv. 129; writing among, iv. 130; Asiatic, after Cyrus's conquest of Lydia, iv. 267; Asiatic, application of, to Sparta, 546 B.C., iv. 268; and Darius, before the battle of Marathon, iv. 426; eminent, liable to be corrupted by success, iv. 503 *seq.*; and Persians, religious conception

of history common to, v. 13; northern, and Xerxes, v. 87, 95; confederate, engagement of, against such as joined Xerxes, v. 97; effect of the battle of Thermopylæ on, v. 144 *seq*; and the battle of Salamis, v. 164 *seq.*; Medising, and Mardonius, v. 201; Medising, at Platæa, v. 220; at Platæa, v. 224 *seq.*; at Mykalê, v. 269 *seq.*; Asiatic, first step to the ascendency of Athens over, v. 269; Sicilian, early governments of, v. 278; Sicilian, progress of, between the battle of Salamis and Alexander, v. 327; allied, oppose the fortification of Athens, v. 329 *seq.*, 335; allied, transfer the headship from Sparta to Athens, B.C. 477, v. 348 *seq.*; allied, Aristeidês' assessment of, v. 359; allied, under Athens, substitute money-payment for personal service, v. 405 *seq.*; effect of the Athenian disaster in Sicily upon, vii. 500; and Tissaphernes, Alkibiades acts as interpreter between, viii. 6 *seq.*; Asiatic, surrender of, by Sparta to Persia, ix. 284; Asiatic, and Cyrus the Younger, ix. 281; Asiatic, and Tissaphernes, ix. 286; the Ten Thousand, their position and circumstances, ix. 15; Ten Thousand at Kunaxa, ix. 56 *seq.*; Ten Thousand, after the battle of Kunaxa, ix. 64 *seq.*; Ten Thousand, retreat of, ix. 75–163, 247 *seq.*; Ten Thousand, after their return to Trapezus, ix. 164–246; Asiatic, their application to Sparta for aid against Tissaphernes, ix. 287; in the service of Alexander in Asia, xii. 99; unpropitious circumstances for, in the Lamian war, xii. 451; Italian, pressed upon by enemies from the interior, xii. 532.

Gryllus, death of, x. 460.

Guilds, Grecian deities of, i. 465; German and early English, iii. 82 *n.*; compared with ancient political associations, viii. 22 *n.*

Gygês, i. 6, iii. 299 *seq.*

Gylippus, expedition of, to Syracuse, vii. 330, 357 *seq.*, 371 *seq.*, 398 *seq.*, 435, 444 *seq.*

Gylon, father of Kleobulê, the mother of Demosthenes, xi. 369 *n.* 2.

Gymnêsii, iii. 48.

Gyndês, distribution of, into channels by Cyrus, iv. 286.

II.

Hadês, i. 8 *seq.*, 9, 13.

Hæmôn and Antigonê, i. 376.

Haliartus, Lysander at, ix. 409.

Halikarnassus, ii. 42, iii. 275; capture of, by Alexander, xii. 127 *seq.*

Halonnesus, dispute between Philip and the Athenians about, xi. 618 *seq.*

Halys, the, iii. 280.

Hamilkar, defeat and death of, at Himera, v. 298 *seq.*

Hamilkar, collusion of, with Agathoklês, xii. 541; superseded in Sicily by another general of the same name, xii. 545.

Hamilkar, victory of, at the Himera, xii. 551 *seq.*; attempt of, upon Syracuse, xii. 570; defeat and death of, xii. 572.

Hannibal, expeditions of, to Sicily, x. 555–573, 583 *seq.*

Hanno, silly fabrication of, xi. 223.

Harmodius and Aristogeitôn, iv. 149 *seq.*

Harmostæ, Spartan, iv. 261 *seq.*, 272, 277.

Harpagus, v. 273, 280.

Harpalus, xii. 323, 397 *seq.*

Harpies, the, i. 1, 321.

Hêbê, i. 13.

Hectôr, i. 389, 403.

Hegemony, Athenian, v. 395 *seq.*

Hegesippus, xi. 617.

Hegesistratus, iv. 159, v. 259, xii. 121, 123.

Hekabê, i. 389.

Hekatæus on Geryôn, i. 339; on the Argonauts, i. 344; and the mythes, i. 525; and the Ionic revolt, iv. 383, 399.

Hekatompylus, Alexander at, xii. 254.

Hekatoncheires, the, i. 6, 7.

Hekatonymus and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 176 *seq.*

Helen, i. 225, 231, 232; necklace of, i. 383; and Paris, i. 391; and Achilles, i. 399; various legends of, i. 414 *seq.*

Helenus and Andromachê, i. 414.

Heliæa, iii. 173 *n.*, iv. 183, 188 *seq.*

Heliasts, iv. 189.

Helikê, destruction of, x. 212.

Helios, i. 8, 466.

Helixus, viii. 181.

Hellanikus, his treatment of mythes, i. 525; contrasted with Saxo Grammaticus and Snorro Sturleson, i. 627.

Hellas, division of, i. 138; proper, ii. 282; mountain systems of, ii. 282 *seq.*; islands and colonies of, ii. 298; most ancient, ii. 358; first historical manifestation of, as an aggregate body, iv. 430.

Hellê and Phryxus, i. 169.

Hellên and his sons, i. 136 *seq.*

Hellênes, i. 136, ii. 315 *seq.*, 341 *seq.*

Hellenic religion and customs in the Trôad, i. 456; cities, ii. 344.

Hellênion at Naukratis, iii. 449.

Hellenism, definition of, xii. 363.

Hellenotamiæ, v. 359, viii. 423.

Hellespont, bridges of Xerxes over, v. 19 *seq.*, 24 *n.* 2; crossed by Xerxes, v. 42; retreating march of Xerxes to, v. 193 *seq.*; Grecian fleet at, B.C. 479, v. 270; Strombichidês at, viii. 127; Peloponnesian reinforcement to, B.C. 411, viii. 139; Dinarus and Thrasyllus at, viii. 138, 146, 157; Athenians and Peloponnesians at, after the battle of Kynossêma, viii. 157; Thrasyllus and Alkibiadês at, viii. 176; Thrasybulus at, ix. 509; Iphikrates at, ix. 513 *seq.*; Antalkidas at, ix. 533; Epaminondas at, x. 413, 419; Timotheus at, x. 413, 419, 507; Autoklês at, x. 511 *seq.*; operations of the Athenians at, B.C. 357, xi.

316; disputes between Athens and Philip about, xi. 623; imprudence of the Persians in letting Alexander cross the, xii. 104.
Helôris, unsuccessful expedition of, xi. 6, 9, 20.
Helots, ii. 503 *seq.*; Pausanias and, v. 366; revolt of, v. 428 *seq.*; at Ithômê, capitulation of, v. 452; assassination of, vi. 500 *seq.*; Brasidean, vii. 29; brought back to Pylus, vii. 95; and the invasion of Laconia by Epaminondas, x. 300; establishment of, with the Messenians, x. 313 *seq.*
Helus conquered by Alkamenês, ii. 565.
Hephæstion, xii. 331, 332, 339, 341, 342.
Hephæstos, i. 13, 79.
Hêræon near Mykênæ, i. 226.
Hêræon Teichos, siege of, by Philip, xi. 428.
Hêrakleia Pontica, i. 330, xii. 622 *seq.*; the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 199.
Hêrakleia in Italy, iii. 515, vi. 20.
Hêrakleia in Sicily, v. 280; Dion at, xi. 123, 125 *seq.*
Hêrakleia Trachinea, vi. 397 *seq.*, vii. 82, ix. 396, 420, xi. 125 *seq.*
Hêrakleid kings of Corinth, ii. 411.
Hêrakleides the Syracusan, exile of, xi. 119; victory of, over Philistus, xi. 139; and Dion, xi. 141, 142, 146, 153, 157 *seq.*, 170; victory of, over Nypsius, xi. 149; death of, xi. 171.
Hêrakleides, governor of the Pontic Herakleia, xii. 635, 636.
Hêrakleids, i. 129, 130, ii. 1 *seq.*; Lydian dynasty of, iii. 298.
Hêraklês, i. 127 *seq.*; attack of, on Pylos, i. 152; and Alkêstis, i. 156; overthrows Orchomenos, i. 176; death of, i. 206; and Hylas, i. 320; and Laomedôn, i. 388; Tyrian, temple of, iii. 362.
Hêraklês, son of Alexander, xii. 502.
Hêrê, i. 8, 9, 13, 78; and Mykênæ, i. 226; temple of, near Argos, burnt, vi. 616; Lakinian, robe of, xi. 31.
Herippidas, ix. 382, 436, 454.
Hermæ, mutilation of, at Athens, vii. 227 *seq.*, 267 *seq.*
Hermeias of Atarneus, xi. 610.
Hermes, i. 13, 80 *seq.*
Hermionê, i. 223.
Hermokratês, at the congress at Gela, vii. 187; and the Athenian armament, vii. 249; recommendations of, after the battle near Olympieion, vii. 309; speech of, at Kamarina, vii. 312; urges the Syracusans to attack the Athenians at sea, vii. 399; postpones the Athenians' retreat from Syracuse, vii. 455; and Tissaphernês, vii. 536; viii. 133; in the Ægean, x. 530 *seq.*; banishment of, x. 534 *seq.*; his return to Sicily, and death, x. 574 *seq.*
Hermokratean party, x. 598; exiles, x. 606.
Hermolaus, xii. 298.
Hermotybii and Kalasiries, iii. 422.
Herodotus, on Minôs, i. 311, 313; on Helen and the Trojans, i. 417; treatment of mythes by, i. 527 *seq.*; his view of Lykurgus, ii. 462; his story of Solon and Crœsus, iii. 201 *seq.*; chronological mistakes of, iii. 208 *n.*, 269 *n.*; chronological discrepancies of, respecting Kyaxarês, iii. 314 *n.* 2; his description of Scythia, iii. 320 *seq.*; his account of Babylon, iii. 390 *seq.*, 399 *n.*; distinction between what he professes to have seen and heard, iii. 413; on the effects of despotism and democracy upon the Athenians, iv. 238; and Ktêsias, on Cyrus, iv. 249; chronology of his life and authorship, iv. 306 *n.*, v. 67 *n.*; his narrative of Darius's march into Scythia, iv. 357 *seq.*; does not mention Pythagoras in connexion with the war between Sybaris and Kroton, iv. 561; historical manner and conception of, v. 7, 15 *n.* 2; his estimate of the number of Xerxes's army, v. 48 *seq.*; doubts about the motives ascribed to Xerxes at Thermopylæ by, v. 119; a proof of the accuracy of, v. 122 *n.*; on the movements of the Persian fleet before the battle of Salamis, v. 135 *nn.*
Heroes appear with gods and men on mythes, i. 87; Greek, at Aulis, i. 393 *seq.*, 469; Greek, analogy of Alexander to, xii. 95.
Heroic race, i. 89; legends, i. 568.
Hesiod, theogony of, i. 5–22, 27, 104; family affairs of, i. 98; Iapetids in, i. 101; complaints of, against kings, ii. 100; dark picture of Greece by, ii. 123.
Hesiodic mythes traceable to Krête and Delphi, i. 21; "Works and Days," i. 88 *seq.*; philosophy, i. 495; Greeks, ii. 153 *seq.*; epic, ii. 160.
Hesionê, i. 388, 389.
Hesperides, dragon of, i. 10.
Hesperides, town of, iv. 44 *n.* 2, 57.
Hestia, i. 8, 9, 80.
Hestiæa on Ilium, i. 444.
Hetæræ, vi. 136.
Hetæries at Athens, vi. 392, viii. 21.
Hexameter, the ancient, i. 100; new metres superadded to, iv. 106.
Hierax, ix. 518.
Hiero of Syracuse, v. 306 *seq.*
Hieromnêmôn, ii. 328.
Hiketas, xi. 181; and the Syracusans, xi. 189; message of, to Corinth and to Timoleon, xi. 202, 203; defeat of, at Adranum, xi. 209; and Magon, xi. 220 *seq.*, 224; flight of, from Syracuse to Leontini, xi. 227; capitulation of, with Timoleon, xi. 241; invites the Carthaginians to invade Sicily, xi. 241; defeat, surrender, and death of, xi. 256, 257.
Himera, iii. 491; battle of, v. 298 *seq.*; treatment of, by Thêro, v. 307; capture of, by Hannibal, x. 566 *seq.*; defeat of Agathokles at the, xii. 551 *seq.*
Hindoos, rivers personified by, i. 463 *n.* 2; their belief with regard to the small pox, i. 485 *n.*; belief of, in fabulous stories, i. 577 *n.*; expensiveness of marriage among, iii. 189 *n.* 2; sentiment of, with regard to

the discontinuance of sacrifices, xii. 57 *n.* 2.
Hindoo Koosh, Alexander at, xii. 271; Alexander reduces the country between the Indus and, xii. 303 *seq.*
Hindostan, hoarding in, xii. 237 *n.* 3.
Hipparchus, ii. 205 *n.*, iv. 149 *seq.*
Hipparinus, son of Dionysius, xi. 183.
Hippeis, Solonian, iii. 159.
Hippias of Elis, viii. 524 *seq.*
Hippias the Peisistratid, iv. 149 *seq.*, 159 *seq.*, 379, 481 *n.* 3.
Hippo, iv. 519.
Hippodameia, i. 217.
Hippodamus, vi. 28.
Hippokleidês, iii. 53.
Hippokratês the physician, i. 500; viii. 586 *n.*
Hippokratês of Gela, v. 285 *seq.*
Hippokratês, the Athenian general, vi. 504 *seq.*, 516, 518 *seq.*, 533.
Hippon, xi. 259.
Hipponikus, iii. 139.
Hipponium, capture of, xi. 23; re-establishment of, xi. 59,
Hipponoidas, vii. 115, 121.
Histiæus and the bridge over the Danube, iv. 367; and Myrkinus, iv. 369, 373; detention of, at Susa, iv. 373; and the Ionic revolt, iv. 383, 400 *seq.*, 416.
Historians, treatment of mythes by, i. 527 *seq.*
Historical proof, positive evidence indispensable to, i. 576; sense of modern times not to be applied to an unrecording age, i. 579; evidence, the standard of, raised with regard to England, but not with regard to Greece, i. 648; and legendary Greece compared, ii. 82 *seq.*
Historicising innovations in the tale of Troy, i. 435; of ancient mythes, i. 552 *seq.*; applicable to all mythes or none, i. 592.
History, uninteresting to early Greeks, i. 481; of England, how conceived down to the seventeenth century, i. 644 *seq.*; and legend, Grecian, blank between, ii. 43 *seq.*; Grecian, first period of, from B.C. 776 to 560, ii. 362, 365; Grecian, second period of, from B.C. 560 to 300, ii. 362 *seq.*; religious conception of, common to Greeks and Persians, v. 13.
Homer and Hesiod, mythology of, i. 16; personality and poems of, ii. 172 *seq.*
Homeric Zeus, i. 17; hymns, i. 45, 50 *seq.*, 61, 80, 82, iii. 225 *seq.*; legend of the birth of Hêraklês, i. 127 *seq.*; Pelops, i. 214; gods, types of, i. 471; age, mythical faith of, i. 483; philosophy, i. 495; account of the inhabitants of Peloponnesus, ii. 17; Boulê and Agora, ii. 90 *seq.*; Greeks, social condition of, ii. 131 *seq.*, 142; Greeks, unity, idea of, partially revived, ii. 218 *seq.*; epoch, right conception of, ii. 235; mode of fighting, ii. 622; geography, iii. 276.
Homêrids, the poetical gens of, ii. 177.
Homicide, purification for, i. 33, 34; mode of dealing with, in legendary and historical Greece, ii. 125 *seq.*; tribunals for, at Athens, iii. 103; Drako's laws of, retained by Solon, iii. 180; trial for, and the senate of, Areopagus, v. 498 *n.*
Homoioi, Spartan, ii. 489, 562.
Hoplêtes, iii. 69.
Hôræ, the, i. 13.
Horkos, i. 9, 11.
Horse, the wooden, of Troy, i. 410, 418.
Horsemen at Athens, after the restoration of the democracy, B.C. 403, viii. 417.
Hospitality in legendary Greece, ii. 109.
Human sacrifices in Greece, i. 172 *seq.*
Hyakinthia and the Lacedæmonians, v. 208.
Hyakinthus, i. 230.
Hyblæan Megara, iii. 488.
Hydarnês, v. 122.
Hydaspes, Alexander at the, xii. 306 *seq.*; Alexander sails down the, xii. 314.
Hydra, the Lernæan, i. 10.
Hydra, sailors of, v. 70 *n* 2.
Hykkara, capture of, vii. 295.
Hylas and Hêraklês, i. 320.
Hylleis, ii. 486.
Hyllus, i. 130, 244.
Hymns, Homeric, i. 45, 50 *seq.*, 61, 80, 82, iii. 225 *seq.*; at festivals in honour of gods, i. 70.
Hypaspistæ, xii. 82.
Hyperbolus, iv. 202, vii. 145 *seq.*, viii. 37.
Hyperides, xi. 703, xii. 401 *n.* 1, 411 *n.* 1, 439, 440.
Hyperiôn, i. 6, 8.
Hypermenês, x. 198.
Hypermnêstra, i. 120.
Hyphasis, Alexander at, xii. 311.
Hypomeiones, Spartan, ii. 489, 562.
Hyrkania, Alexander in, xii. 255.

I.

Ialmenos and Askalaphos, i. 178.
Iapetids in Hesiod, i. 101.
Iapetos, i. 6, 8.
Iapygians, iii. 523.
Iasus, capture of, vii. 534.
Iberia in Spain, iii. 374.
Iberians and Dionysius, x. 713.
Ida in Asia, iii. 263, 265.
Ida in Crête, Zeus at, i. 8.
Idanthyrsus, iv. 360.
Idas, i. 233, 236.
Idomenê, Demosthenês at, vi. 415 *seq.*
Idrieus, xi. 603.
Ikarus, i. 307.
Iliad and the Trojan war, i. 403; and Odyssey, date, structure, and authorship of, ii. 171–279.
Ilium, i. 388, 436 *seq.*
Illyria, Dionysius's schemes of conquest in, xi. 33.
Illyrians, different tribes of, iv. 1 *seq.*; retreat of Perdikkas and Brasidas before, vi. 606 *seq.*; victory of Philip over, xi. 302 *seq.*; defeat of, by Alexander, xii. 36 *seq.*

Ilus, i. 387, 388.
Imbros, iv. 38, 374 *seq.*
Imilkon and Hannibal, invasion of Sicily by, x. 583 *seq.*; at Agrigentum, x. 589 *seq.*; at Gela, x. 620 *seq.*; and Dionysius, x. 631 *seq.*; at Motyê, x. 677, 683; capture of Messênê by, 685 *seq.*; and the Campanians of Ætna, x. 693; before Syracuse, x. 695 *seq.*; flight of, from Syracuse, x. 712; miserable end of, x. 714.
Inachus, i. 113.
Indus, Alexander at, xii. 303 *seq.*, 314 *seq.*; voyage of Nearchus from the mouth of, to that of the Tigris, xii. 317, 318.
Industry, manufacturing, at Athens, iii. 182 *seq.*
Infantry and oligarchy, iii. 42.
Inland and maritime cities contrasted, ii. 299.
Inô, i. 169 *seq.*
Inscriptions, ii. 56.
Interest on loans, iii. 145 *seq.*, 217.
Interpreters, Egyptian, iii. 437.
Io, legend of, i. 115 *seq.*
Iôn, i. 272, 280.
Iônia, emigrants to, ii. 33 *seq.*; conquest of, by Harpagus, iv. 273; Mardonius's deposition of despots in, iv. 422; expedition of Astyochus to, vii. 525; expedition of Thrasyllus to, viii. 174.
Ionian, the name a reproach, iii. 228.
Ionians, ii. 16, 17; and Darius's bridge over the Danube, iv. 363 *seq.*; abandonment of, by the Athenians, iv. 392; at Ladê, iv. 405 *seq.*; at Mykalê, v. 260 *seq.*, 266; after the battle of Mykalê, v. 268.
Ionic emigration, ii. 28, 33 *seq.*, iii. 232; tribes in Attica, iii. 68, 71 *seq.*; cities in Asia, iii. 232 *seq.*, 349; and Italic Greeks, iii. 533; revolt, iv. 383 *seq.*, 413 *n.* 2; philosophers, iv. 514; Sicilians and Athens, vii. 180; alphabet and the Athenian laws, viii. 421.
Iphigeneia, i. 398.
Iphiklos, i. 150.
Iphikrates, destruction of a Lacedæmonian *mora* by, ix. 455 *n.* 2, 474 *n.*, 482 *seq.*; military improvements and successes of, ix. 467 *seq.*, 490; defeat of Anaxibius by, ix. 513 *seq.*; proceedings of, between B.C. 387–378, x. 143 *seq.*; and Kotys, x. 144, 410, 508, 514; expedition of, to Korkyra, x. 202 *seq.*, 209 *n.*; and Timotheus, x. 202, 409, xi. 316 *seq.*; expedition of, to aid Sparta against Thebes, x. 324 *seq.*; in Thrace and Macedonia, x. 342 *seq.*, 409; in the Hellespont, xi. 316; and Chares, xi. 316 *seq.*
Iphikrates the Younger, xii. 174.
Ipsus, battle of, xii. 522.
Iran, territory of, iv. 252.
Irasa, iv. 43.
Iris, i. 10.
Iron race, the, i. 90.
Isagoras, iv. 170, 220 *seq.*
Ischagoras, vi. 614.
Ischolaus, x. 297.
Ischys, i. 245.
Isidas, x. 456.
Islands in the Ægean, ii. 313.
Ismenias in the north of Bœotia, ix. 420; and Leontiades, x. 80; trial and execution of, x. 86.
Ismenias and Pelopidas, x. 380 *seq.*, 387, 391.
Isokratês, his treatment of mythes, i. 547 *n.* 4; on the origin of Periœki, ii. 495; panegyrical oration of, x. 59, 105; the Plataic oration of, x. 220; the Archidamus of, x. 313 *n.*, 314 *n.* 1, 399 *n.*; his letter to Philip, xi. 394, 603.
Issêdones, iii. 330.
Issus, Alexander at, before the battle, xii. 155; Darius at, before the battle, xii. 158; battle of, xii. 159 *seq.*; inaction of Darius after the battle of, xii. 206; and its neighbourhood, as connected with the battle, xii. 665 *seq.*
Isthmian games, i. 170, ii. 323, iv. 88 *seq.*; Eleians excluded from, i. 191, ii. 411 *n.* 2, B.C. 412, vii. 507; and Agesilaus, ix. 477.
Istônê, Korkyræan fugitives at, vi. 376, 424, 486 *seq.*
Italia, iii. 468.
Italian Greeks, iii. 494, 525, 527 *seq.*, ix. 11 *seq.*, 187, xii. 532.
Italians, iii. 503.
Italy and Sicily, early languages and history of, iii. 474 *n.*
Italy, the voyage from Greece to, iii. 483; Grecian colonies in, iii. 476, 482, 501 *seq.*; decline of Greek power in, after the fall of Sybaris, iv. 558; Southern, affairs of, B.C. 382–369, xi. 59.
Ithômê, ii. 574, 575, v. 429.

Jason, i. 157 *seq.*, 317 *seq.*
Jason of Pheræ, x. 187 *seq.*, 199 *n.*, 208, 257 *seq.*, 265 *seq.*
Jaxartes, Alexander at the, xii. 276 *seq.*
Jocasta, i. 361 *seq.*
Jurkæ, iii. 330.
Jury-trial, characteristics of, exhibited in the Athenian dikasteries, v. 521 *seq.*

K.

Kabala, victory of Dionysius at, xi. 57.
Kabeirichus, x. 117.
Kadmeia at Thebes, seizure of, by Phœbidas, x. 79 *seq.*; surrender of, by the Lacedæmonians, x. 121 *seq.*
Kadmus, i. 350 *seq.*
Kalais and Zêtês, i. 273.
Kalasiries and Hermotybii, iii. 422.
Kalauria, i. 76; Amphiktyony at, i. 183; the Athenian allied armament at, x. 200; death of Demosthenes at, xii. 440 *seq.*
Kalchas, wanderings and death of, i. 423.
Kalê Aktê, foundation of, vii. 170.
Kallias, treaty of, v. 455 *seq.*
Kallias, son of Kalliades, vi. 97, 100.
Kallias at the congress at Sparta, B.C. 371, x. 223.

Kallias of Chalkis, xi. 476 *seq.*, 626.
Kallibius, the Lacedæmonian, viii. 329, ix. 261.
Kallibius of Tegea, x. 285.
Kalliklês, in Plato, viii. 526 *seq.*
Kallikratidas, viii. 218 *seq.*, 359.
Kallimachus, the polemarch, iv. 464, 474.
Kallippus, iv. 104, 110.
Kallipidæ, iii. 323.
Kallippus, xi. 173 *seq.*, xi. 181 *seq.*
Kallirrhoe, i. 10, 383.
Kallisthenês, the historian, i. 551.
Kallisthenes, the general, failure and condemnation of, x. 510, xi. 585.
Kallisthenes of Olynthus, xii. 288, 291 *seq.*, 300 *seq.*
Kallistô, i. 241.
Kallistratus, x. 149, 221 *seq.*, 232, 395, xi. 372.
Kallixenus, viii. 265 *seq.*, 275, 279.
Kalpê, the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 201 *seq.*
Kalydônian boar, i. 195, 199 *seq.*
Kamarina, iii. 490; restoration of, to independence, v. 321; and the Athenians, vii. 265; Athenian and Syracusan envoys at, vii. 312 *seq.*; neutral policy of, B.C. 415, vii. 318; evacuation of, x. 624; and Timoleon, xi. 264.
Kambyses, iv. 63, 295 *seq.*
Kandaulês, iii. 299.
Kannônus, psephism of, viii. 266 *n.*
Kanôpic branch of the Nile, opening of, to Greek traffic, iii. 437.
Kapaneus, i. 372, 377.
Kappadokia subdued by Alexander, xii. 149.
Kardia, Athenian fleet at, viii. 162; alliance of, with Philip, xi. 623; Eumenes of, xii. 99.
Karduchians, and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 129 *seq.*
Karia, resistance of, to Daurisês, iv. 397.
Karmania, Alexander's bacchanalian procession through, xii. 318.
Karneian festival, ii. 411 *n.* 2, v. 106.
Karneius Apollo, i. 67.
Karnus, ii. 4.
Karpathus, ii. 42.
Karystus, iv. 447, v. 412.
Kasmenæ, ii. 490.
Kassander, Alexander's treatment of, xii. 341; schemes of, on Antipater's death, xii. 457; and Polysperchon, war between, xii. 486; gets possession of Athens, xii. 487; in Peloponnesus, xii. 493; defeat of Olympias by, xii. 494; confederacy of, with Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleukus against Antigonus, xii. 496, 502, 517, 522; founds Kassandreia and restores Thebes, xii. 496; and Alexander, son of Polysperchon, xii. 497, 499; and the Ætolians, xii. 499; measures of Antigonus against, xii. 498, 500; great power of, in Greece, xii. 500; Ptolemy, and Lysimachus, pacification of, with Antigonus, xii. 501; compact of Polysperchon with, xii. 502, 515; Ptolemy makes a truce with, xii. 504; success of Demetrius Poliorketes in Greece against, xii. 516; truce of, with Demetrius Poliorketes, xii. 522; death of, xii. 525.
Kassandra, i. 413.
Kastôr and Pollux, i. 231 *seq.*
Katabothra, ii. 291.
Katana, iii. 487 and Ætna, v. 320; Alkibiadês at, vii. 265; Nikias at, vii. 319; conquest of, by Dionysius, x. 650; Carthaginian naval victory near, x. 690; Hiketas and Magon at, xi. 221.
Katônakophori, iii. 48.
Katreus and Althæmenês, i. 306.
Kaulonia, iii. 514, xi. 19, 23; Dikon of, xi. 39.
Kaunus, Antisthenês at, vii. 545.
Kâystru-Pedion, march of Cyrus from Keramôn-Agora to, ix. 23 *n.*
Kebalinus, xii. 258, 259, 263.
Kekrops, i. 266 *seq.*; the second, i. 279.
Kelænæ, Alexander at, xii. 136.
Keleos, i. 51 *seq.*, 276.
Keleustes, vi. 271 *n.*
Kenchreæ, Peloponnesian fleet at, vii. 524.
Kentrites, the Ten Thousand Greeks at the, ix. 135 *seq.*
Kephallênia, iii. 551, vi. 183, 191.
Kephalus, i. 268 *n.* 3, 271; and Dionysius at Syracuse, xi. 236.
Kephisodotus, x. 515, 519.
Kerasus, the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 172.
Kersobleptes, x. 518; and Charidemus, x. 518, 521, 522; intrigues of, against Athens, xi. 362; and the peace and alliance between Athens and Philip, xi. 549 *seq.*; defeat of, by Philip, xi. 613.
Kertch, tumuli near, xii. 658 *seq.*
Ketô, i. 9, 10.
Keyx and Alcyone, i. 185.
Kilikia, Alexander in, xii. 153, 154; Darius in, xii. 157.
Kimon and Themistoklês, v. 378, 381; capture of Skyros by, v. 410, 413 *n.* 2.; victories of, at the Eurymedon, v. 417; trial and acquittal of, v. 423, 494; and the Spartan application for aid against the Helots, v. 432, 494; recall of, from ostracism, v. 446; death of, v. 454, 501; political party of, v. 489; and Periklês, v. 447, 490 *seq.*, 501; character of, v. 492; ostracism of, v. 494.
Kimonian treaty, the so-called, v. 455 *seq.*
Kinadon, conspiracy and character of, ix. 343 *seq.*
King, the, in legendary Greece, ii. 84 *seq.*, 101 *seq.*; the, in historical Greece, ii. 104; English theory of a, iii. 17.
Kings, Egyptian, iii. 432, 441 *n.* 3.
Kingship, discontinuance of, in Greece generally, ii. 104, iii. 10; in mediæval and modern Europe, iii. 10 *seq.*
Kinyps and Dorieus, iv. 53.
Kirrha, 81 *n.* 2, iv. 82 *seq.*, xi. 647 *seq.*, 656.

Kirrhæans, punishment of, iv. 83 *seq.*
Kissidas, x. 362, 363.
Klarus temple of Apollo at, iii. 218.
Klazomenæ, iii. 254, vii. 512, 529, 538.
Kleander of Gela, v. 281.
Kleander the Lacedæmonian, ix. 204 *seq.*, 209, 212, 227, xii. 266.
Kleandridas, vi. 20.
Kleandridês, v. 472.
Klearchus the Lacedæmonian, at the Hellespont, viii. 130; at Byzantium, viii. 173; and Cyrus the Younger, ix. 11, 29 *seq.*; and Menon's soldiers, ix. 47; and Ariæus, ix. 69; and Tissaphernes, ix. 83, 93 *seq.*
Klearchus of the Pontic Herakleia, xii. 624 *seq.*
Klearidas, vi. 615, 645, 647, vii. 5.
Kleinas, iii. 139.
Kleisthenês of Sikyon, i. 379, ii. 174, iii. 45 *seq.*
Kleisthenês the Athenian, revolution in Attic tribes by, iii. 85, 91; and the oracle at Delphi, iv. 163; retirement and recall of, iv. 221, 222; development of Athenian energy after, iv. 238; changes in the constitution of, after the Persian war, v. 374.
Kleippidês, vi. 302 *seq.*
Kleitarchus, xi. 622, 626.
Kleitus the Illyrian, xii. 36 *seq.*
Kleitus, Alexander's general, xii. 114, 281 *seq.*
Kleobulê, mother of Demosthenes, xi. 369.
Kleobûlus and Xenarês, vii. 32 *seq.*
Kleokritus, viii. 369.
Kleombrotus, x. 128 *seq.*, 175, 185, 238 *seq.*, 243 *seq.*
Kleomenês I., his expeditions to Athens, iv. 164, 220 *seq.*; and Aristagoras, iv. 386; defeat of Argeians by, iv. 432 *seq.*; return of, without attacking Argos, iv. 435; trial of, iv. 436; and the Æginetans, iv. 439, 443; and Demaratus, iv. 439 *seq.*; violent proceedings and death of, v. 62.
Kleomenês III., ii. 470, 471.
Kleomenês, Alexander's satrap, xii. 323, 340, 341 *n.* 1.
Kleon the Athenian, first mention of, by Thucydidês, vi. 331; policy and character of, vi. 334, 656 *seq.*; and Mitylênê, vi. 338 *seq.*; political function of, vi. 392, 394; and the prisoners in Sphakteria, vi. 444 *seq.*; expedition of, to Pylus, vi. 454 *seq.*; warlike influence of, vi. 482, 621 *seq.*; at Amphipolis, vi. 630 *seq.*, 638 *seq.*; capture of Torônê by, vi. 632; at Eion, vi. 633; Thucydidês's treatment of, vi. 655, 660 *seq.*; and Aristophanês, vi. 657 *seq.*, 666.
Kleon, of Halikarnassus, ix. 328, 418.
Kleônæ and Argos, ii. 625, iv. 88 *n.* 3.
Kleonikê and Pausanias, v. 347.
Kleonymus, xii. 606, 607.
Kleopatra, wife of Philip, xi. 708 *seq.*, 715 *n.* 2, xii. 6 *seq.*, 11.
Kleopatra, daughter of Philip, xi. 710, xii. 432, 503.
Kleophon, viii. 166, 310.
Kleôpus, iii. 252.
Kleruchies, Athenian, revival of B.C. 365, vi. 50 *n.* 2, x. 406 *seq.*
Kleruchs, Athenian, in Chalkis, iv. 229; in Lesbos, vi. 348; after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 304.
Klonas, musical improvements of, iv. 102.
Klothô, i. 9.
Klymenê, i. 8.
Klytæmnêstra, i. 222, 231.
Knêmus, vi. 262 *seq.*, 274, 284.
Knidus, settlement of, ii. 42; maritime contests near, B.C. 412, vii. 542; Antisthenês and Astyochus at, vii. 518; the battle of, ix. 392; and Agesilaus, ix. 433; reverses of Sparta after the battle of, ix. 442.
Knights at Athens, viii. 417, ix. 253.
Knôpus, iii. 252.
Kodrids, i. 154.
Kodrus, ii. 32; archons after, iii. 65.
Kœnus, xii. 263, 264, 312.
Kœos, i. 6, 8.
Kœratadas, viii. 181, ix. 220, 224.
Kôês, iv. 364, 369, 385.
Kokalus, i. 307 *seq.*
Kôlæus, his voyage to Tartêssus, iii. 375.
Kôlakretæ, iv. 184.
Kolchians and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 154, 172.
Kolchis, and the Argonautic expedition, i. 323, 340.
Kolônus, Athenian assembly at, viii. 47.
Kolophôn, iii. 247 *seq.*
Konipodes, iii. 49.
Konon at Naupaktus, vii. 493; at Andros, viii. 206; appointment of, to succeed Alkibiadês, viii. 216; at Samos, viii. 218; at Mitylênê, viii. 227 *seq.*; escape of, from Ægospotami, viii. 298; renewed activity of, ix. 354, 374; at Rhodes, ix. 375; visit of, to the Persian court, ix. 389 *seq.*; and Pharnabazus, ix. 391, 442, 446 *seq.*; rebuilds the Long Walls of Athens, ix. 447; large plans of, ix. 453; sent as envoy to Tiribazus, ix. 498; arrest of, ix. 501; long absence of, from Athens, x. 146 *n.* 3.
Kopaïs, lake of, i. 181.
Korkyra and the Argonauts, i. 327; early inhabitants of, iii. 540; relations of, with Corinth, iii. 541 *seq.*; relations of, with Epirus, iii. 543; and Corinth, joint settlements of, iii. 544 *seq.*; commerce of, iii. 550; and Corinth, disputes between, vi. 69 *seq.*; application of the Epidamnian democracy to, vi. 71; and Corinth, hostilities between, vi. 75, 86 *seq.*; and Corinth, decision of the Athenians between, vi. 84; oligarchical violence at, vi. 364 *seq.*; vengeance of the victorious Demos at, B.C. 427, vi 372 *seq.*; Nikostratus and Alkidas at, vi. 379; revolutions at, contrasted with those at Athens, vi. 382; distress at, B.C. 425, vi. 424; expedition of Eurymedon and Sophoklês to, vi. 424 *seq.*, 486 *seq.*; muster of the Athenian armament at, vii. 246; Demosthenês's voyage from, to Sicily, vii. 414; renewed troubles at, viii. 160; Lacedæmonian expedition against, x. 193 *seq.*; expedition of Iphikrates to,

x. 202 *seq.*; Kleonymus and Agathokles in, xii. 607.
Korkyræan envoys, speech of, to the Athenian assembly, vi. 79 *seq.*; captives return home from Corinth, vi. 360 *seq.*; oligarchical fugitives at Istônê, vi. 376, 424, 480 *seq.*
Korkyræans, and Xerxes's invasion, v. 90; attack Epidamnus, vi. 72; remonstrate with the Corinthians and Peloponnesians, vi. 74; seek the alliance of Athens, vi. 77 *seq.*
Korôbius and the foundation of Kyrênê, iv. 41.
Korôneia, Athenian defeat at, v. 471; Theban victory at, ix. 434 *seq.*, 441.
Korônis and Asklêpius, i. 245.
Korynéphori, iii. 48.
Kôs, settlement of, ii. 42; capture of, by Astyochus, vii. 547; revolt of, from Athens, xi. 310 *seq.*, 325.
Kossæi, xii. 334.
Kottas, i. 6.
Kottyphus, xi. 657, 663.
Kotyóra, the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 174 *seq.*
Kotys and Iphikrates, x. 145, 410, 508, 514; and Athens, x. 408 *seq.*, 512, 514; and Timotheus, x. 413, 507; and Miltokythes, x. 512; capture of Sestos by, x. 514; assassination of, x. 516.
Kranaus, i. 269.
Krannon, battle of, xii. 433.
Kraterus and Philôtas, xii. 260 *seq.*; and Antipater, xii. 431 *seq.*, 452; death of, xii. 452.
Kratês, comedy of, viii. 449.
Kratesippidas, viii. 173, 189.
Kratinus, viii. 447, 454 *n.*
Kreôn, king of Thêbes, i. 161, 375.
Kreôn, archon at Athens, iii. 66.
Kresphontês, ii. 2 *seq.*, 445 *n.*
Krêtan settlements on the Gulf of Tarentum, i. 308; and Phrygian worship, iii. 291.
Krêtans and Minôs, i. 309; in the time of Homer, ii. 138; and Xerxês, v. 90.
Krête, migrations of Dorians to, ii. 39; early Dorians in, ii. 417; Periœki in, ii. 491 *n.* 2; Phalækus in, xi. 599.
Krêthêis and Pêleus, i. 157.
Krétheus, descendants of, i. 155.
Krœûsa, i. 272, 280.
Krimêsus, Timoleon's victory over the Carthaginians at the, xi. 246 *seq.*
Krios, i. 6, 8.
Krissa, iv. 81 *seq.*
Kritias and Sokratês, vii. 48 *seq.*; return of, to Athens, viii. 316 *seq.*; and Theramenês, viii. 329 *seq.*, 340 *seq.*; death of, viii. 368.
Krius, iv. 439, 443.
Krommyon, capture of, ix. 466; recovery of, ix. 490.
Kromnus, capture of Lacedæmonians at, x. 433 *seq.*
Kronium, Dionysius at, xi. 57.
Krónos, i. 6 *seq.*, 11.
Krotôn, foundation, territory, and colonies of, iii. 504 *seq.*; fall of, iii. 525; maximum power of, iii. 528; citizens and government of, iii. 535; and Pythagoras, iv. 538 *seq.*; and Sybaris, iv. 554 *seq.*; capture of, by Dionysius, xi. 31; expedition from Syracuse to, xii. 536.
Krypteia, ii. 509.
Kteatos and Eurytos, i. 190.
Ktêsias and Herodotus on Cyrus, iv. 249; on Darius, iv. 356.
Ktesiphon, xi. 514, xii. 385 *seq.*
Kunaxa, battle of, ix. 56 *seq.*
Kurêtes, ceremonies of, i. 41.
Kyaxarês, iii. 312, 343.
Kydonta, vi. 275.
Kyknus, i. 399.
Kylôn the Athenian, attempted usurpation of, iii. 110 *seq.*
Kylôn of Krotôn, iv. 550.
Kyllyrii at Syracuse, v. 278.
Kymæans and Pactyas, iv. 271.
Kymê, iii. 259; Alkibiadês at, viii. 208.
Kynegeirus, iv. 474.
Kynossêma, battle of, viii. 147 *seq.*
Kynurians, ii. 407; in Argolis, ii. 608.
Kypselus, iii. 54; fall of the dynasty of, iii. 58.
Kyrênê, foundation of, iv. 39 *seq.*; situation, fertility and prosperity of, iv. 43 *seq.*; and the Libyans, iv. 46 *seq.*, 56 *seq.*; second migration of Greeks to, iv. 55; and Egypt, iv. 56; reform of, by Demônax, iv. 58; Periœki at, iv. 60; third immigration to, iv. 61; under Arkesilaus the Third, iv. 62; submission of, to Kambysês, iv. 296; history of, from about B.C. 450 to 306, xii. 578 *seq.*; Ophellas, viceroy of, xii. 582 *seq.*
Kythêra, capture of, by the Athenians, vi. 496 *seq.*
Kytinium, occupation of, by Philip, xi. 668.
Kyzikus and the Argonauts, i. 320; revolt of, from Athens, viii. 151; siege of, by Mindarus, viii. 162; battle of, viii. 163.

L.

Labdalum, vii. 340, 368.
Lacedæmonian envoys to Persia, B.C. 430, vi. 246; embassy to Athens about the prisoners in Sphakteria, vi. 440 *seq.*; reinforcement to Brasidas in Chalkidikê, vi. 614; envoys, at the congress at Corinth, B.C. 421, vii. 20; envoys at Athens, about Panaktum and Pylus, vii. 40; embassy to Athens, against the alliance of Athens with Argos, vii. 60 *seq.*; army, vii. 108, 111 *n.*; assembly, speech of Alkibiadês in, vii. 321 *seq.*; fleet under Agesandridas, viii. 91, 96; fleet, victory of, near Eretria, viii. 97 *seq.*; *mora*, destruction of a, by Iphikrates, ix. 482 *seq.*; auxiliaries to the Phokians at Thermopylæ, xi. 579, 582.
Lacedæmonians and Cyrus the Great, iv. 268;

attack of, upon Polykratês, iv. 327; and Themistoklês, v. 199, 380, 384; and Mardonius's offer of peace to the Athenians, v. 205 *seq.*; invoke the aid of their allies against the Helots, v. 429; dismiss their Athenian auxiliaries against the Helots, v. 430 *seq.*; expedition of, into Bœotia, B.C. 458, v. 443 *seq.*; victory of, at Tanagra, v. 445; proceedings of, on Phormio's victory over the Peloponnesian fleet near Rhium, vi. 274; proceedings of, for the recovery of Pylus, vi. 430, 432 *seq.*; occupation of Sphakteria by, vi. 432, 463; blockade of, in Sphakteria, vi. 438 *seq.*, 451 *seq.*, 463 *seq.*; offers of peace from, after the capture of Sphakteria, vi. 479; assassination of Helots by, vi. 500 *seq.*; and the Peace of Nikias, vii. 4; liberate the Arcadian subjects of Mantinea, and plant Helots at Lepreum, vii. 29; exclusion of, from the Olympic festival, vii. 77 *seq.*; detachment of, to reinforce Epidaurus, B.C. 419, vii. 94; and their allies, invasions of Argos by, vii. 96 *seq.*, 138; Gylippus sent to Syracuse by, vii. 330; fortification of Dekeleia by, vii. 395, 486; and the Four Hundred, viii. 88; recapture of Pylus by, viii. 176; defeat of, at Arginusæ, viii. 232 *seq.*; repayment of, by the Athenians, after the restoration of democracy, B.C. 403, viii. 417; assassination of Alkibiadês demanded by, viii. 429; the Cyreians under, ix. 234, 241, 288, 300, 436; and Dorieus, ix. 377 *seq.*; and Corinthians, conflicts between, B.C. 393, ix. 454 *seq.*; victory of, within the Long Walls of Corinth, ix. 463 *seq.*; and the Olynthian confederacy, x. 76; seizure of the Kadmeia at Thebes by, x. 81 *seq.*; trial and execution of Ismenias by, x. 86; their surrender of the Kadmeia at Thebes, x. 121 *seq.*; defeat of, at Tegyra, x. 182; expulsion of, from Bœotia, B.C. 374, x. 183; at Kromnus, x. 433 *seq.*; at Mantinea, B.C. 362, x. 452, 460, 465, 467 *seq.*; and Alexander, xii. 17, vi. 85, 87.

Lachês, expedition to Sicily under, vii. 181.

Lachesis, i. 9.

Laconia, genealogy of, i. 230; population of, ii. 488; gradual conquest of, ii. 561; modern, ii. 563 *n.* 2, 611 *n.* 2; invasions of, by Epaminondas, x. 294 *seq.*, 453 *seq.*; western, abstraction of, from Sparta, x. 310 *seq.*

Ladê, combined Ionic fleet at, iv. 405 *seq.*; victory of Persian fleet at, iv. 411.

Laius and Œdipus, i. 361.

Lakes and marshes of Greece, ii. 290.

Lamachus, vii. 201, 261 *seq.*, 348.

Lamia, Antipater at, xii. 424 *seq.*

Lamian war, xii. 424 *seq.*, 451.

Lampsakus, revolt of, viii. 127; recovery of, by Strombichidês, viii. 129.

Language, Greek, dialects of, ii. 318.

Lanikê, xii. 281.

Laocoön, i. 411.

Laomedôn, i. 77, 388.

Laphystios, Zeus, i. 171.

Laphystius and Timoleon, xi. 271.

Larissa, Asiatic, iii. 258 *n.* 3, 259.

Lash, use of, by Xerxes, v. 34, 43.

Lasthenes and Euthykrates, xi. 489, 490.

Latin, Oscan, and Greek languages, iii. 473.

Latium, emigration from Arcadia to, iii. 470 *n.* 2; plunder of, by Dionysius, xi. 34.

Latins, Œnotrians and Epirots, relationship of, iii. 470.

Latona and Zeus, offspring of, i. 13.

Laurium, mines of, v. 74 *seq.*

Laws, authority of, in historical Athens, ii. 111; of Solon, iii. 179 *seq.*; of Zaleukus, iii. 511; and psephisms, distinction between, v. 504; enactment and repeal of, at Athens, v. 504 *seq.*

Layard's "Nineveh and its Remains," iii. 409.

Learchus and Eryxô, iv. 58.

Lebedos, revolt of, from Athens, vii. 517.

Lechæum, capture of, by the Lacedæmonians, ix. 466 *n.* 2, 471.

Léda, and Tyndareus, i. 230 *seq.*

Legend of Dêmêtêr, i. 58 *seq.*; of the Delphian oracle, i. 65; of Pandôra, i. 104 *n.* 1, 105; of Io, i. 115 *seq.*; of Hêraklês, i. 127 *seq.*; Argonautic, i. 317 *n.*, 332 *seq.*, 345 *seq.*; of Troy, i. 386 *seq.*; of the Minyæ from Lemnos, ii. 36; and history, Grecian, blank between, ii. 43 *seq.*

Legendary Greece, social state of, ii. 82–159; poems of Greece, value of, ii. 79 *seq.*

Legends, mystic, i. 43 *seq.*; of Apollo, i. 61 *seq.*; of Greece, originally isolated, afterwards thrown into series, i. 145; of Mêdea and Jasôn, i. 162 *n.*; change of feeling with regard to, i. 255; Attic, i. 264; ancient, deeply rooted in the faith of the Greeks, i. 296, 478; of Thebes, i. 349 *seq.*; divine, allegorised, heroic historicised, i. 568; of saints, i. 629 *seq.*; of Asia Minor, iii. 301.

Lêkythus, capture of, by Brasidas, vi. 578.

Leleges, ii. 353.

Lelex, i. 230.

Lemnos and the Argonauts, i. 319; early condition of, iv. 38; conquest of, by Otanês, iv. 374; Miltiadês at, iv. 375 *seq.*

Lending houses, iii. 218.

Leokrates, xi. 696.

Leon and Diomedon, vii. 527 *seq.*; viii. 38.

Leon the Spartan, viii. 26, 127.

Leon, mission of, to Persia, x. 381, 383.

Leonidas at Thermopylæ, v. 103 *seq.*, 117 *seq.*

Leonnatus, xii. 427, 432.

Leontiades, the oligarchy under, x. 38 *n.* 2; conspiracy of, x. 79 *seq.*; at Sparta, x. 85; Thebes under, x. 108, 110; conspiracy against, x. 111 *seq.*; death of, x. 118.

Leontini, iii. 487; intestine dissension at, vii. 191; Demos at, apply to Athens, vii. 194, 196; Dionysius at, B.C. 396, x. 612, 650, 689; the mercenaries of Dionysius at, xi. 3; Philistus at, xi. 138; Dion at,

xi. 148, 151, 152; Hiketas at, xi. 227, 241; surrender of, to Timoleon, xi. 257.
Leosthenes the admiral, x. 509, 510.
Leosthenes the general, xii. 418, 421 *seq.*
Leotychidês the Prokleid, ii. 580; chosen king of Sparta, iv. 440; and Æginetan hostages, iv. 443, v. 64; at Mykalê, v. 261; banishment of, v. 353.
Leotychidês, son of Agis II., ix. 335, 338.
Lepreum and Elis, ii. 592, vii. 24; Brasidean Helots at, vii. 29.
Leptinês, brother of Dionysius, x. 682, 684, 691, xi. 18, 46, 58.
Leptinês the Athenian, xi. 380.
Leptinês, general of Agathokles, xii. 594, 597.
Lesbians, their application to Sparta, vi. 103.
Lesbos, early history of, iii. 262 *seq.*; an autonomous ally of Athens, vi. 2; Athenian kleruchs in, vi. 348; application from, to Agis, vii. 502; expedition of the Chians against, vii. 526 *seq.*; Thrasyllus at, viii. 137; Kallikratidas in, viii. 223; Thrasybulus in, ix. 509; Memnon in, xii. 141; recovery of, by Macedonian admirals, xii. 192.
Lêthê, i. 9.
Lêtô, i. 8, 13.
Leukas, iii. 544 *seq.*
Leukon of Bosporus, xii. 651.
Leukothea, the temple of, i. 330.
Leuktra, the battle of, x. 239 *seq.*; treatment of Spartans defeated at, x. 261 *seq.*; extension of Theban power after the battle of, x. 263; proceedings in Peloponnesus after the battle of, x. 269, 331; position of Sparta after the battle of, x. 273; proceedings in Arcadia after the battle of, x. 278 *seq.*; proceedings and views of Epaminondas after the battle of, x. 291 *seq.*
Libya, first voyages of Greeks to, iv. 39; nomads of, iv. 46 *seq.*; expedition of Kambyses against, iv. 297.
Libyans and Greeks at Kyrênê, iv. 53 *seq.*; and Dionysius, x. 713.
Liby-Phœnicians, x. 543.
Lichas and the bones of Orestes, ii. 602; and the Olympic festival, iv. 97 *n.* 2, vii. 74 *n.*, 80; mission of, to Milêtus, vii. 546, 548, viii. 132.
Lilybæum, defeat of Dionysius near, xi. 61.
Limos, i. 9, 14 *n.* 3.
Lion, the Nemean, i. 10.
Lissus, foundation of, xi. 33.
Livy, his opinion as to the chances of Alexander, if he had attacked the Romans, xii. 350; on the character of Alexander, xii. 357 *n.* 1.
Lixus and Tingis, iii. 367 *n.* 2.
Loans on interest, iii. 145, 217.
Localities, epical, i. 338.
Lochages, Spartan, ii. 619.
Lochus, Spartan, ii. 617 *seq.*; Macedonian, xii. 81.
Logographers and ancient mythes, i. 509, 524 *seq.*
Lokri, Epizephyrian, early history of, iii. 507 *seq.*; and Dionysius, x. 663, xi. 23, 29, 32; Dionysius the Younger at, xi. 146, 187 *seq.*
Lokrian coast opposite Eubœa, Athenian ravage of, vi. 184.
Lokrians, ii. 384; Ozolian, ii. 392; Italian, iii. 508 *seq.*, iv. 231 *n.*; of Opus and Leonidas, v. 105; and Phokians, xi. 352, 355; of Amphissa, xi. 648, 649.
Lokris and Athens, v. 449, 472.
Long Walls at Megara, v. 437; at Athens, v. 440 *seq.*, 444, 450, vi. 28, viii. 314, ix. 447 *seq.*; at Corinth, ix. 463 *seq.*
Lucanians, xi. 12 *seq.*, 187.
Lucretius and ancient mythes, i. 563 *n.* 2.
Lydia, early history of, iii. 298 *seq.*
Lydian music and instruments, iii. 288, 297; monarchy, iii. 354, iv. 259 *seq.*
Lydians, iii. 291 *seq.*, 297, iv. 269.
Lykæus, Zeus, i. 239.
Lykambês and Archilochus, iv. 109.
Lykaôn and his fifty sons, i. 238 *seq.*
Lykia, conquest of, by Alexander, xii. 131.
Lykidas, the Athenian senator, v. 210.
Lykomêdês, x. 354 *seq.*, 385, 394.
Lykophrôn, son of Periander, iii. 57.
Lykophrôn, despot of Phcræ, xi. 366, 408, 411.
Lykurgus the Spartan, laws and discipline of, ii. 455–469, 512–560.
Lykurgus the Athenian, xii. 375, 511.
Lykus, i. 281; and Dirkê, i. 358.
Lynkeus and Idas, i. 233.
Lyre, Hermes the inventor of, 181.
Lyric poetry, Greek, ii. 184, iv. 99, 125.
Lysander, appointments of, as admiral, viii. 187 *n.*, 288; character and influence of, viii. 188, ix. 416; and Cyrus the Younger, viii. 190 *seq.*, 289, 291; factions organized by, in the Asiatic cities, viii. 194; at Ephesus, viii. 207, 288; victory of, at Notium, viii. 209; superseded by Kallikratidas, viii. 218; revolution at Milêtus by the partisans of, viii. 290; operations of, after the battle of Arginusæ, viii. 292 *seq.*; victory of, at Ægospotami, viii. 295 *seq.*; proceedings of, after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 302; at Athens, viii. 307 *seq.*, 322; conquest of Samos by, viii. 323; triumphant return of, to Sparta, viii. 324; ascendency and arrogance of, after the capture of Athens, viii. 356, ix. 282, 327 *seq.*; opposition to, at Sparta, viii. 358, ix. 282; contrasted with Kallikratidas, viii. 359; expedition of, against Thrasybulus, viii. 374; dekarchies established by, ix. 255 *seq.*, 272; contrasted with Brasidas, ix. 269; recall and temporary expatriation of, ix. 283; introduction of gold and silver to Sparta by, ix. 319 *seq.*; intrigues of, to make himself king, ix. 329, 332 *seq.*, 418; and Agesilaus, ix. 337 *seq.*, 355, 359 *seq.*; and the Bœotian war, ix. 403, 408; death of, ix. 409.
Lysias, seizure of, by the Thirty at Athens,

viii. 337; speech of, against Phormisius's disfranchising proposition, viii. 404; proposed citizenship of, viii. 423; oration of, against Ergoklês, ix. 510; oration of, at Olympia, B.C. 384, x. 101 *seq.*; panegyrical oration of, xi. 40 *seq.*, 48 *n.*
Lysiklês, vi. 315.
Lysiklês, general at Chæroneia, xi. 693.
Lysimachus, confederacy of, with Kassander, Ptolemy, and Seleukus, against Antigonus, xii. 496, 502, 517, 522; Kassander, Ptolemy, and Seleukus, pacification of, with Antigonus, xii. 501; and Amastris, xii. 634; and Arsinoê, xii. 634 *seq.*; death of, xii. 636; and the Pentapolis on the south-west coast of the Euxine, xii. 639.

M.

Macedonia, Mardonius in, iv. 423; Perdikkas and Brasidas in, vi. 600, 604 *seq.*; increasing power of, from B.C. 414, x. 60; and Athens, contrasted, x. 63; kings of, after Archelaus, x. 65; state of, B.C. 370, x. 339, 341; Iphikrates in, x. 342 *seq.*; Timotheus in, x. 411; government of, xi. 297 *seq.*; military condition of, under Philip, xi. 395 *seq.*, xii. 75 *seq.*; and conquered Greece, xii. 2, 71; and the Greeks, on Alexander's accession, xii. 12; Antipater, viceroy of, xii. 90, 92; and Sparta, war between, xii. 378 *seq.*; Grecian confederacy against, after Alexander's death, xii. 421 *seq.*; Kassander in, xii. 494; Demetrius Poliorketes acquires the crown of, xii. 525.
Macedonian dynasty, iv. 21, 23; envoys at Athens, xi. 537, 541, 551, 555; phalanx, xi. 691, xii. 80 *seq.*, 338; interventions in Greece, B.C. 336–335, xii. 21 *seq.*; pike, xii. 77, 136 *seq.*; troops, xii. 82 *seq.*; officers of Alexander's army in Asia, xii. 98; fleet, master of the Ægean, xii. 192; soldiers of Alexander, mutiny of, xii. 326 *seq.*
Macedonians, ii. 311, iv. 2 *n.*, 10 *seq.*; conquered by Megabazus, iv. 372; poverty and rudeness of, xi. 396; military aptitude of, xii. 90; small loss of, at the battle of the Granikus, xii. 116.
Machaôn and Podaleirius, i. 248.
Mæandrius, iv. 331 *seq.*
Mæonians and Lydians, iii. 297.
Magians, massacre of, after the assassination of Smerdis, iv. 304.
Magistrates of early Athens, v. 477 *seq.*; Athenian, from the time of Periklês, v. 481, 484, 496 *seq.*
Magna Græcia, iii. 534.
Magnêsia, iii. 241, 260; Xerxes's fleet near, v. 115 *seq.*; on the Pagasæan Gulf, xi. 425 *n.* 3.
Magnêtes, Thessalian and Asiatic, ii. 381.
Magon, off Katana, x. 690; near Abakæna, xi. 8; at Agyrium, xi. 10; death of, xi. 57.
Magon and Hiketas, xi. 220 *seq.*; death of, xi. 242.
Maia and Zeus, offspring of, i. 13.
Makrônes and the Ten Thousand, ix. 153.
Malians, ii. 382.
Malli, xii. 315.
Mallus, Alexander at, xii. 154.
Mamerkus and Timoleon, xi. 255 *seq.*
Manetho and the Sothiac period, iii. 454 *seq.*
Mania, sub-satrap of Æolis, ix. 291 *seq.*
Mantinea and Tegea, ii. 596 *seq.*, vi. 617, vii. 19; and Sparta, ii. 598; vii. 29, 129, x. 47 *seq.*; and Argos, vii. 29; congress at, vii. 91 *seq.*; battle of, B.C. 418, vii. 106 *seq.*; expedition of Agesipolis to, x. 47 *seq.*; and the river Ophis, x. 48 *n.* 2; re-establishment of, x. 279 *seq.*; march of Agesilaus against, x. 287 *seq.*; muster of Peloponnesian enemies to Thebes at, x. 452; attempted surprise of, by the cavalry of Epaminondas, x. 456 *seq.*; battle of, B.C. 362, x. 460 *seq.*, 482; peace concluded after the battle of, x. 481.
Mantineans and the Pan-Arcadian union, x. 442 *seq.*; opposition of, to Theban intervention, x. 448.
Mantinico-Tegeatic plain, x. 464.
Mantitheus and Aphepsion, vii. 273 *seq.*
Mantô, iii. 248.
Marakanda, Alexander at, xii. 276, 280 *seq.*
Marathon, battle of, iv. 463–485.
Marathus surrenders to Alexander, xii. 175.
Mardi and Alexander, xii. 240, 255.
Mardonius, in Ionia, iv. 422; in Thrace and Macedonia, iv. 423; fleet of, destroyed near Mount Athos, iv. 423; urges Xerxes to invade Greece, v. 4 *seq.*, 10; advice of, to Xerxes after the battle of Salamis, v. 189; forces left with, in Thessaly, v. 193; and Medising Greeks, after Xerxes's retreat, v. 201; in Bœotia, v. 203, 214 *seq.*; offers of peace to Athens by, v. 204 *seq.*, 210; at Athens, v. 209; and his Phokian contingent, v. 218; on the Asôpus, v. 226; at Platæa, v. 228 *seq.*
Marine, military, unfavourable to oligarchy, iii. 42.
Maritime and inland cities contrasted, iii. 299.
Marpêssa and Idas, i. 236.
Marriage in legendary Greece, ii. 113; among the Spartans, ii. 519; among the Hindoos, iii. 189 *n.* 2.
Marshes and lakes of Greece, ii. 290.
Marsyas, iii. 289 *n.*, 290.
Masistês, v. 268.
Masistius, v. 222.
Maskamês, v. 401.
Massagetæ, iii. 331.
Massalia, iii. 377, 465, 537 *seq.*, xii. 613 *seq.*
Mausôlus and the Social War, xi. 313.
Mazæus at Thapsakus, xii. 204; at the battle of Arbela, xii. 222, 224; surrender of Babylon by, xii. 228; appointed satrap of Babylon by Alexander, xii. 230.
Mazarês, iv. 270 *seq.*
Mêdea and the Argonauts, i. 323 *seq.*
Medes, early history of, iii. 304 *seq.*; and Persians, iv. 251, 303 *seq.*

Media, the wall of, iii. 407 *n.* 2, ix. 85, 87 *n.*; Darius a fugitive in, xii. 241, 244.
Medius, xii. 342.
Medus, i. 281 *n.* 3, 330.
Medusa, i. 10, 124.
Megabates, iv. 381, 382.
Megabazus, iv. 369, 372.
Megabyzus, v. 452.
Megaklês, iii. 51 *n.*, 52, 112.
Megalopolis, capture of, by Agathokles, xii. 560.
Megalopolis, foundation of, ii. 599, x. 306 *seq.*, 319 *n.* 5; the centre of the Pan-Arcadian confederacy, x. 317; disputes at, x. 493; and Sparta, xi. 280, 368, 405, 418 *seq.*
Megapenthes and Perseus, i. 124.
Megara, early history of, iii. 3, 59 *seq.*; Corinth and Sikyôn, analogy of, iii. 64; and Athens, iii. 123 *seq.*, v. 435, 472, 475 *n.*, 476, vi. 104, 504 *seq.*; Long Walls at, v. 437; Brasidas at, vi. 511 *seq.*; revolution at, vi. 514 *seq.*; Philippising faction at, xi. 621.
Megara in Sicily, iii. 488, v. 290.
Megarian Sicily, iii. 488.
Megarians under Pausanias, and Persian cavalry under Masistius, v. 222; repudiate the peace of Nikias, vi. 674, vii. 3; refuse to join Argos, vii. 22; recovery of Nisæa by, viii. 178.
Megarid, Athenian ravage of, in the Peloponnesian war, vi. 185.
Meidias of Skepsis, ix. 293 *seq.*
Meidias the Athenian, xi. 478, 479 *n.* 1.
Meilaniôn and Atalanta, i. 203.
Meilichios, meaning of, ix. 236 *n.*
Melampus, i. 43, 150, 535, v. 122.
Melanippus and Tydeus, i. 373, 379.
Melanthus, ii. 31.
Meleager, legend of, i. 195 *seq.*
Meleagrides, i. 198.
Melêsippus, vi. 171.
Melian nymphs, i. 7.
Melissus, vi. 39, viii. 466, 470.
Melkarth, temple of, iii. 362.
Mellon, x. 111 *seq.*, 120.
Mêlos, settlement of, ii. 38; expedition against, under Nikias, vi. 399; capture of, vii. 148 *seq.*; Antisthenês at, vii. 546.
Memnôn, son of Tithônus, i. 405.
Memnôn the Rhodian, operations of, between Alexander's accession and landing in Asia, xii. 65, 103; and Mentor, xii. 100; advice of, on Alexander's landing in Asia, xii. 105; made commander-in-chief of the Persians, xii. 123; at Halikarnassus, xii. 128 *seq.*; his progress with the Persian fleet, and death, xii. 141 *seq.*; change in the plan of Darius after his death, xii. 144, 147.
Memphis, Alexander at, xii. 198.
Men, races of, in "Works and Days," i. 88 *seq.*
Mendê, and Athens, vi. 599 *seq.*
Menecdæus, and the Ambrakiots, vi. 413 *seq.*
Menekleidas and Epaminondas, x. 367, 417 *seq.*
Menekles, viii. 275.
Menelaus, i. 221 *seq.*, iii. 363 *n.*
Menestheus, i. 422, ii. 30.
Menœkeus, i. 372.
Menœtius, i. 8, 12.
Menon the Thessalian, ix. 41, 96.
Menon the Athenian, x. 513.
Mentor the Rhodian, xi. 607 *seq.*, xii. 100.
Mercenary soldiers, multiplication of, in Greece after the Peloponnesian war, xi. 392 *seq.*
Mermnads, Lydian dynasty of, iii. 300.
Meroê, connection of, with Egyptian institutions, iii. 419.
Messapians, iii. 524; and Tarentines, xii. 532.
Messênê, foundation of, ii. 568, iii. 490; foundation of, by Epaminondas, x. 308, 319 *n.* 5, 358; and Sparta, x. 398, 481, xi. 281, 368, 405.
Messênê, in Sicily, chorus sent to Rhegium from, iv. 73 *n.* 1; re-colonisation of, by Anaxilaus, v. 287; Lachês at, vii. 181; Athenian fleet near, vii. 183; Alkibiadês at, vii. 264; Nikias at, vii. 304; and Dionysius, x. 660 *seq.*, xi. 4; Imilkon at, x. 685 *seq.*; and Timoleon, xi. 223.
Messênia, Dorian settlements in, ii. 11, 419.
Messênian genealogy, i. 235; wars, ii. 567–590; victor proclaimed at Olympia, B.C. 368, x. 359.
Messênians and Spartans, early proceedings of, ii. 445; expelled by Sparta, ix. 317, xi. 4; plan of Epaminondas for the restoration of, x. 292.
Messênians in Sicily, defeated by Naxians and Sikels, vii. 185.
Metaneira, i. 52.
Metapontium, iii. 517.
Methana, Athenian garrison at, vi. 486.
Methônê, iv. 30; Philip at, xi. 364.
Methônê in Peloponnesus, Athenian assault upon, vi. 182.
Methymna, vi. 300, 306; Kallikratidas at, viii. 224.
Metics, and the Thirty at Athens, viii. 337.
Mêtis and Zeus, daughter of, i. 13.
Metrodôrus, i. 563, 595 *n.*
Metropolis, relation of a Grecian, to its colonies, vi. 82 *n.* 3.
Midas, iii. 284, 295.
Middle ages, monarchy in, iii. 10 *seq.*
Mikythus, v. 311, 313, 323.
Milesian colonies in the Trôad, i. 458.
Milesians and Lichas, viii. 132; and Kallikratidas, viii. 221.
Milêtus, early history of, iii. 237 *seq.*; and Alyattês, iii. 344 *seq.*; and Crœsus, iii. 348; sieges of, by the Persians, iv. 391, 413; Histiæus of, iv. 367 *seq.*, 373, 378, 383, 400 *seq.*; Phrynichus's tragedy on the capture of, iv. 418; exiles from, at Zanklê, v. 285 *seq.*; and Samos, dispute between, vi. 36; revolt of, from Athens, vii.

516, 529, 531 *seq.*; Tissaphernes at, vii. 518, 548; Lichas at, vii. 548; Peloponnesian fleet at, viii. 34, 128, 130 *seq.*, 137; revolution at, by the partisans of Lysander, viii. 290; capture of, by Alexander, xii. 123 *seq.*

Military array of legendary and historical Greece, ii. 142 *seq.*; divisions not distinct from civil in any Grecian cities but Sparta, ii. 619; force of early oligarchies, iii. 42; order, Egyptian, iii. 422; arrangements, Kleisthenean, iv. 181.

Miltas, xi. 122.

Miltiadês the First, iv. 157.

Miltiadês the Second, iv. 159; and the bridge over the Danube, iv. 366, 370 *n.*; his retirement from the Chersonese, iv. 370; capture of Lemnos and Imbros by, iv. 375; escape of, from Persian pursuit, iv. 415; adventures and character of, iv. 452 *seq.*; elected general, 490 B.C., iv. 461; and the battle of Marathon, iv. 463 *seq.*; expedition of, against Paros, iv. 491; disgrace, punishment, and death of, iv. 492 *seq.*

Milto, ix. 63 *n.*

Miltokythes, x. 512, 520.

Milton on the early series of British kings, i. 646; his treatment of British fabulous history, i. 650.

Mimnermus, iv. 110.

Mindarus, supersedes Astyochus, viii. 133; deceived by Tissaphernês, viii. 134; removal of, from Milêtus to Chios, viii. 137; eludes Thrasyllus and reaches the Hellespont, viii. 138, 139 *n.*; at the Hellespont, viii. 146; Peloponnesian fleet summoned from Eubœa by, viii. 149; siege of Kyzikus by, viii. 162; death of, viii. 163.

Mineral productions of Greece, ii. 305.

Minôa, capture of, by Nikias, vi. 385.

Minôs, i. 299 *seq.*

Minôtaur, the, i. 301 *seq.*

Minyæ, i. 180, ii. 36 *seq.*

Minyas, i. 175 *seq.*

Miraculous legends, varied interpretation of, i. 632 *n.* 2.

Mistake of ascribing to an unrecording age the historical sense of modern times, i. 579.

Mitford, his view of the anti-monarchical sentiment of Greece, iii. 15 *seq.*

Mithridates the Persian, ix. 118 *seq.*

Mithridates of Pontus, xii. 626, 627.

Mithrines, xii. 120, 280.

Mitylenæan envoys, speech of, to the Peloponnesians at Olympia, vi. 306 *seq.*; prisoners sent to Athens by Pachês, vi. 330, 348.

Mitylenæans at Sigeium, i. 457.

Mitylênê, iii. 262; political dissensions and poets of, iii. 267; revolt of, from Athens, vi. 300 *seq.*; blockade of, by Pachês, vi. 321 *seq.*; and the Athenian assembly, vi. 331, 337 *seq.*; loss and recovery of, by Atlæns, B.C. 412, vii. 526, 527; Kallikratidas at, viii. 226 *seq.*; removal of Kallikratidas from, viii. 231; Eteonikus at, viii. 231, 237, 256; blockade of, by Memnon, xii. 142; surrender of, by Charês, xii. 192.

Mnasippus, expedition of, to Korkyra, x. 193 *seq.*

Mnêmosynê, i. 6, 13.

Mnêsiphilus, v. 167.

Mœræ, and Crœsus, iv. 264 *seq.*

Mœris, lake of, iii. 450 *n.*

Molionids, the, i. 190.

Molossian kingdom of Epirus, xii. 533.

Molossians, iii. 555 *seq.*

Molossus, i. 258.

Mômus, i. 9.

Monarchy, in mediæval and modern Europe, iii. 10 *seq.*; aversion to, in Greece, after the expulsion of Hippias, iv. 236.

Money, coined, not known to Homeric or Hesiodic Greeks, ii. 157; coined, first introduction of, into Greece, ii. 428.

Money-lending at Florence in the middle ages, iii. 148 *n.*; and the Jewish law, iii. 150 *n.*; and ancient philosophers, iii. 153.

Money-standard, Solon's debasement of, iii. 137; honestly maintained at Athens after Solon, iii. 155.

Monsters, offspring of the gods, i. 14.

Monstrous natures associated with the gods, i. 1.

Monts de Piété, iii. 218.

Monuments of the Argonautic expedition, i. 329 *seq.*

Moon, eclipse of, B.C. 413, vii. 432; eclipse of, B.C. 331, xii. 205.

Mopsus, iii. 248.

Mora, Spartan, ii. 617 *seq.*; destruction of a Spartan, by Iphikrates, ix. 482 *seq.*

Moral and social feeling in legendary Greece, ii. 108.

Moralising Greek poets, iv. 122 *seq.*

Mosynœki, and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 174.

Mothakes, ii. 563.

Motyê, capture of, by Dionysius, x. 675 *seq.*; recapture of, by Imilkon, x. 683.

Motyum, Duketius at, vii. 168.

Mountainous systems of Greece, ii. 282 *seq.*

Müller on Sparta as the Dorian type, ii. 459.

Multitude, sentiment of a, compared with that of individuals, ix. 378.

Munychia and Piræus, Themistoklês's wall round, v. 339; Menyllus in, xii. 439, 457; Nikanor in, xii. 452, 465.

Muse, inspiration and authority of the, i. 478.

Muses, the, i. 13.

Music, ethical effect of old Grecian, ii. 583; Greek, improvements in, about the middle of the seventh century B.C., iv. 102; comprehensive meaning of, among the ancient Greeks, viii. 477.

Musical modes of the Greeks, iii. 288.

Musicians, Greek, in the seventh century B.C., iv. 102 *n.*

Mῦθos, i. 480, 578 *n.*, 618.
Mutilated Grecian captives at Persepolis, xii. 234.
Mutilation of dead bodies in legendary and historical Greece, ii. 124; of Bessus, xii. 279.
Mutiny at Athens immediately before Solon's legislation, iii. 132.
Myēlonia, iii. 284.
Mykalē, Pan-Ionic festival at, iii. 239; the battle of, v. 260 *seq.*
Mykalēssus, massacre at, vii. 490 *seq.*
Mykēnæ, i. 125 *seq.*
Myriandrus, Alexander's march from Kilikia to, xii. 154; Alexander's return from, xii. 158.
Myrkinus, iv. 369, 399.
Myrmidons, origin of, i. 253.
Myrŏn, iii. 44.
Myrŏnidēs, v. 439, 449.
Myrtilus, i. 217.
Mysia, the Ten Thousand Greeks in, ix. 237 *seq.*
Mysians, iii. 265, 282 *seq.*, 292.
Mysteries, principal Pan-Hellenic, i. 38, 50, 55, 58, v. 282 *n.*; and mythes, i. 585.
Mystic legends, connexion of, with Egypt, i. 43; legends, contrast of, with Homeric hymns, i. 45; brotherhoods, iii. 115.
Mythe of Pandôra and Prometheus, how used in "Works and Days," i. 97; meaning of the word, i. 480.
Mythes, how to be told, i. 2; Hesiodic, traceable to Krête and Delphi, i. 21; Grecian, origin of, i. 5, 71, 83 *seq.*, 461 *seq.*; of the gods, discrepancies in, i. 71 *n.*, 72; contain gods, heroes and men, i. 87; formed the entire mental stock of the early Greeks, i. 460, 482; difficulty of regarding them in the same light as the ancients did, i. 461; Grecian, adapted to the personifying and patriotic tendencies of the Greeks, i. 468 *seq.*; Grecian, beauty of, i. 473, 474; Grecian, how to understand properly, i. 474 *seq.*; how regarded by superior men in the age of Thucydidês, i. 506; accommodated to a more advanced age, i. 508 *seq.*; treatment of, by poets and logographers, i. 509 *seq.*; treatment of, by historians, i. 526 *seq*; historicised, i. 552 *seq.*; treatment of, by philosophers, i. 562 *seq.*; allegorised, i. 562 *seq.*; semi-historical interpretation of, i. 574; allegorical theory of, i. 584; connexion of, with mysteries, i. 585; supposed ancient meaning of, i. 588; Plato on, i. 591 *seq.*, v. 595; recapitulation of remarks on, i. 603 *seq.*; familiarity of the Greeks with, i. 608 *seq.*; bearing of, on Grecian art, i. 614 *seq.*; German, i. 622; Grecian, proper treatment of, i. 651 *seq.*; Asiatic, iii. 301.
Mythical world, opening of, i. 1; sentiment in "Works and Days," i. 93 *seq.*; geography, i. 334 *seq.*; faith in the Homeric age, i. 483; genealogies, i. 596 *seq.*; age, gods and men undistinguishable in, i. 601; events, relics of, i. 612; account of the alliance between the Hêrakleids and Dorians, ii. 2; races of Greece, ii. 26.
Mythology, Grecian, sources of our information on, i. 146; German, Celtic, and Grecian, i. 619, 620; Grecian, how it would have been affected by the introduction of Christianity, B.C. 500, i. 626.
Mythopœic faculty, stimulus to, i. 473; age, the, i. 487; tendencies, by what causes enfeebled, i. 487 *seq.*; tendencies in modern Europe, i. 628 *seq.*
Myūs, iii. 241.

N.

Napoleon, analogy between his relation to the confederation of the Rhine, and that of Alexander to the Greeks, xii. 69.
Nature, first regarded as impersonal, i. 496.
Naukraries, iii. 71, 91.
Naukratis, iii. 438, 449 *seq.*
Naupaktus, origin of the name, ii. 4; Phormio's victory near, vi. 275 *seq.*; Eurylochus's attack upon, vi. 407; Demosthenês at, vi. 408; naval battle at, B.C. 413, vii. 492 *seq.*
Nausinikus, census in the archonship of, x. 155 *seq.*
Naval attack, Athenian, vi. 87.
Naxians and Sikels, defeat of Messenians by, vii. 185.
Naxos, early power of, iii. 224; expedition of Aristagoras against, iv. 380 *seq.*; Datis at, iv. 445; revolt and re-conquest of, v. 416; Chabrias at, viii. 285, x. 176 *seq.*
Naxos in Sicily, iii. 483, vii. 264, x. 650.
Nearchus, voyages of, xii. 314, 317, 318, 320.
Nebuchadnezzar, iii. 444.
Necklaces of Eriphylê and Helen, i. 382 *seq.*
Nectanebus, xi. 608.
Negative side of Grecian philosophy, viii. 471.
Neileus, or *Nēleus*, i. 154, ii. 33, iii. 237.
Nekŏs, iii. 441 *seq.*
Nektanebis, x. 499, 504.
Nēleids down to Kodrus, i. 154.
Nēleus and Pelias, i. 149 *seq.*
Nemean lion, the, i. 10; games, ii. 625, ix. 88 *seq.*
Nemesis, i. 9.
Neobulê and Archilochus, iv. 109.
Neon the Cyreian, ix. 185 *seq.*, 202.
Neon the Corinthian, xi. 220 *seq.*
Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, i. 258, 409, 421.
Neoptolemus the actor, xi. 517.
Nephelê, i. 168 *seq.*
Nereus, i. 9, 10.
Nereids, i. 10.
Nessus, the centaur, i. 206.
Nestor, i. 153.
Niebelungen Lied, i. 640.
Nikæa on the Hydaspes, xii. 308, 313.
Nikanor, xii. 457, 465 *seq.*

Nikias, at Minôa, vi. 385; position and character of, vi. 386 *seq.*; and Kleon, vi. 392 *seq.*, 621 *seq.*; at Mêlos, vi. 399; in the Corinthian territory, vi. 483 *seq.*; at Mendê and Skiônê, vi. 601 *seq.*; peace of, vi. 670 *seq.*, vii. 1 *seq.*; and the Spartans taken at Sphakteria, vii. 8 *seq.*; embassy of, to Sparta, vii. 66; and Alkibiadês, vii. 144 *seq.*, viii. 215; appointed commander of the Sicilian expedition, B.C. 415, vii. 201; speeches and influence of, on the Sicilian expedition, B.C. 415, vii. 202 *seq.*, 212, 217; his plan of action in Sicily, vii. 260; dilatory proceedings of, in Sicily, vii. 295, 304, 354 *seq.*; stratagem of, for approaching Syracuse, vii. 297; at the battle near the Olympeion at Syracuse, vii. 300; measures of, after his victory near the Olympeion at Syracuse, vii. 303; at Messênê in Sicily, vii. 304; forbearance of the Athenians towards, vii. 306 *seq.*; at Katana, vii. 319; in Sicily in the spring of B.C. 414, vii. 332; his neglect in not preventing Gylippus's approach to Sicily and Syracuse, vii. 360 *seq.*, 364 *seq.*; fortification of Cape Plemmyrium by, vii. 369; at Epipolæ, vii. 373; despatch of, to Athens for reinforcements, vii. 376 *seq.*, 384 *seq.*; opposition of, to Demosthenês's proposals for leaving Syracuse, vii. 424 *seq.*; consent of, to retreat from Sysacuse, vii. 431; exhortations of, before the final defeat of the Athenians in the harbour of Syracuse, vii. 441 *seq.*; and Demosthenês, resolution of, after the final defeat in the harbour of Syracuse, vii. 454; exhortations of, to the Athenians on their retreat from Syracuse, vii. 459 *seq.*; and his division, surrender of, to Gylippus, vii. 470 *seq.*, 478 *n.* 2; and Demosthenês, treatment of, by their Syracusan conquerors, vii. 477; disgrace of, at Athens after his death, vii. 479; opinion of Thucydidês about, vii. 480; opinion and mistake of the Athenians about, vii. 483 *seq.*

Nikodromus, v. 65.

Nikoklês, x. 34.

Nikomachus the Athenian, viii. 419 *seq.*

Nikomachus the Macedonian, xii. 258, 259, 263.

Nikostratus, vi. 367 *seq.*, 601 *seq.*

Nikoteles, x. 647.

Nile, the, iii. 414.

Nineveh, or *Ninus*, siege of, iii. 315; capture of, iii. 343; and Babylon, iii. 390; site of, iii. 395 *n.*; and its remains, iii. 409.

Nine Ways, nine defeats of the Athenians at the, x. 413 *n.* 2.

Ninon and Kylon, iv. 550.

Niobê, i. 216.

Nisæa, alleged capture of, by Peisistratus, iii. 218 *n.*; connected with Megara by "Long Walls," v. 437; surrender of, to the Athenians, vi. 506 *seq.*; recovery of, by the Megarians, viii. 178.

Nisus, i. 281, 302.

Nobles, Athenian, early violence of, iv. 205.

Nomads, Libyan, iv. 50 *seq.*

Nomios Apollo, i. 83.

Nomophylakes, v. 502.

Nomothetæ, iii. 165, 168, v. 504, viii. 405.

Non-Amphiktyonic races, ii. 361.

Non-Hellenic practices, ii. 341.

Non-Olympiads, ii. 586.

Notium, iii. 247; Pachês at, vi. 328; recolonised from Athens, vi. 330; battle of, viii. 209.

Notus, i. 8.

Numidia, Agathokles and the Carthaginians in, xii. 577.

Nymphæum, xi. 369, *n.* 2, xii. 650.

Nymphs, i. 7, 10.

Nypsius, xi. 149, 150, 153, 155.

Nyx, i. 6, 9.

O.

Oarus, fortresses near, iv. 359.

Oath of mutual harmony at Athens, after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 306.

Obæ or Obês, ii. 487.

Ocean, ancient belief about, iii. 385 *n.*

Oceanic nymphs, i. 7.

Oceanus, i. 6, 7, 10.

Ochus, x. 506, xi. 605 *seq.*, xii. 100 *seq.*

Odeon, building of, vi. 29.

Odes at festivals in honour of gods, i. 70.

Odin and other gods degraded into men, i. 624.

Odrysian kings, vi. 286 *seq.*

Odysseus, i. 395; and Palamêdês, i. 400; and Ajax, i. 407; steals away the Palladium, i. 410; return of, from Troy, i. 419; final adventures and death of, i. 425 *seq.*; at the agora in the second book of the Iliad, ii. 95 *seq.*

Odyssey and Iliad, date, structure, authorship and character of, ii. 171–278.

Œchalia, capture of, i. 206.

Œdipus, 361 *seq.*

Œneus and his offspring, i. 194 *seq.*

Œnoê, vi. 172, viii. 112, ix. 479.

Œnomaus and Pelops, i. 217.

Œnônê, i. 408 *n.* 4.

Œnophyta, Athenian victory at, v. 418.

Œnotria, iii. 468 *seq.*

Œnotrians, iii. 470, 503, 526.

Œta, path over Mount, v. 107.

Œtæi, ii. 383.

Office, admissibility of Athenian citizens to, iv. 195.

Ogygês, i. 266.

Okypetê, i. 10.

Olbia, xii. 641 *seq.*

Oligarchical government, change from monarchical to, in Greece, iii. 21 *seq.*; party at Athens, v. 489, viii. 318 *seq.*, 413 *seq.*; Greeks, corruption of, vii. 552; conspiracy at Samos, viii. 8 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*; conspiracy at Athens, viii. 21, 41 *seq.*; exiles, return of, to Athens, viii. 315.

Oligarchies in Greece, iii. 24, 39, 40, 42.

Oligarchy, conflict of, with despotism, iii. 38; vote of the Athenian assembly in favour of,

viii. 20; establishment of, in Athenian allied cities, viii. 45; of the Four Hundred, viii. 46 *seq.*, 59 *seq.*, viii. 102, 123 *seq.*
Olive trees, sacred, near Athens, iii. 182 *n.* 2, vi. 362 *n.* 2.
Olpæ, Demosthenes's victory at, vi. 410 *seq.*
Olympia, Agesipolis, and the oracle at, ix. 494; Lysias at, x. 101 *seq.*; panegyrical oration of Isokrates at, x. 105; occupation of, by the Arcadians, x. 431, 440; topography of, x. 438 *n.*; plunder of, by the Arcadians, x. 440 *seq.*
Olympias, xi. 337, 707, 712, 716; and Antipater, xii. 92, 341, 345 *n.*; intrigues of, after Alexander's death, xii. 449; return of, from Epirus to Macedonia, xii. 458 *seq.*, 493; death of, xii. 494; Epirus governed by, xii. 533 *n.* 3.
Olympic games, and Aëthlius, i. 137; origin of, i. 192; presidency of, ii. 13, 426 *seq.*; nature and importance of, ii. 321, 322; the early point of union between Spartans, Messenians, and Eleians, ii. 449; and the Delian festival, iv. 74; celebrity, history and duration of, iv. 75 *seq.*; interference of, with the defence of Thermopylæ, v. 106; and the Karneia, v. 106 *n.*; conversation of Xerxes on, v. 155; of the 90th Olympiad, vii. 71 *seq.*; celebration of, by the Arcadians and Pisatans, x. 436 *seq.*; legation of Dionysius to, xi. 37 *seq.*
Olympieion near Syracuse, battle of, vii. 299 *seq.*
Olympus, ii. 282.
Olympus, the Phrygian, iii. 289 *n.*, iv. 102.
Olynthiac, the earliest, of Demosthenês, xi. 456 *seq.*; the second, of Demosthenês, xi. 462 *seq.*; the third, of Demosthenês, xi. 468 *seq.*
Olynthiacs of Demosthenês, order of, xi. 499 *seq.*
Olynthian confederacy, x. 67 *seq.*, 92, 524, xi. 452; war, xi. 454–505.
Olynthus, iv. 32; capture and repopulation of, by Artabazus, v. 202; increase of, by Perdikkas, vi. 95; expedition of Eudamidas against, x. 78; Teleutias at, x. 88 *seq.*; Agesipolis at, x. 91; submission of, to Sparta, x. 92; alliance of, rejected by the Athenians, xi. 331; alliance of, with Philip, xi. 332 *seq.*; secedes from the alliance of Philip, and makes peace with Athens, xi. 446; hostility of Philip to, xi. 447; Philip's half-brothers flee to, xi. 449; intrigues of Philip in, xi. 449; attack of Philip upon, xi. 454, 462; alliance of, with Athens, xi. 455; renewed application of, to Athens, against Philip, xi. 462; assistance from Athens to, B.C. 350, xi. 467; three expeditions from Athens to, B.C. 349–348, xi. 467 *n.*, 487; expedition of Athenians to, B.C. 349, xi. 482, 484; capture of, by Philip, xi. 488 *seq.*, 505, 507, 516.
Oneirus, i. 9, ii. 247.
Oneium, Mount, Epaminondas at, x. 348.
Onesilus, iv. 393 *seq.*
Onomaklês, viii. 113 *seq.*
Onomakritus, v. 4.
Onomarchus, and the treasures in the temple at Delphi, xi. 358; successes of, xi. 360, 409; at Chæroneia, xi. 361; power of the Phokians under, xi. 366; aid to Lykophron by, xi. 409; death of, xi. 411.
Ophellas, xii. 578, 582 *seq.*
Ophis, the, x. 48.
Opici, iii. 471.
Opis, Alexander's voyage to, xii. 327.
Oracle at Delphi, legend of, i. 65; and the Krêtans, i. 309 *n.* 2; and the Battiad dynasty, iv. 61; answers of, on Xerxes's invasion, v. 81 *seq.*
Oracles, consultation and authority of, among the Greeks, ii. 340; in Bœotia consulted by Mardonius, v. 203.
Orations, funeral, of Periklês, vi. 42, 192 *seq.*
Orchomenians, i. 423.
Orchomenus, ante-historical, i. 174 *seq.*; and Thêbes, i. 184, v. 216 *n.* 2, x. 264.
Orchomenus, early historical, ii. 394; capitulation of, B.C. 418, vii. 102; revolt of, from Thebes to Sparta, ix. 408; and the Pan-Arcadian union, x. 285, 287; destruction of, x. 426.
Oreithyia, i. 273.
Orestês, i. 223 *seq.*; and Agamemnôn transferred to Sparta, i. 229.
Orestês, bones of, ii. 602.
Oreus, xi. 621, 626.
Orgies, post-Homeric, i. 35.
Orœtês, iv. 308, 330.
Orontês, the Persian nobleman, ix. 49, 54 *n.*
Orontês, the Persian satrap, x. 30, 31.
Orôpus, vi. 523 *n.* 1, viii. 34, x. 392.
Orphans in legendary and historical Greece, ii. 124.
Orpheotelestæ, iii. 119.
Orpheus, i. 28, 30.
Orphic Theogony, i. 22 *seq.*; egg, i. 23; life, the, i. 31; brotherhood, i. 45.
Orsines, xii. 319.
Orthagoridæ, iii. 43 *seq.*
Orthros, i. 10.
Ortygês, iii. 253.
Ortygia, iii. 486; fortification and occupation of, by Dionysius, x. 636 *seq.*; Dionysius besieged in, x. 642 *seq.*; blockade of, by Dion, 133, 137, 160; sallies of Nypsius from, xi. 150, 153, 155; Dion's entry into, xi. 164; surrender of, to Timoleon, xi. 212 *seq.*; advantage of, to Timoleon, xi. 219; siege of, by Hiketas and Magon, xi. 220 *seq.*; Timoleon's demolition of the Dionysian works in, xi. 233; Timoleon erects courts of justice in, xi. 234.
Oscan, Latin and Greek languages, iii. 473.
Oscans, iii. 471.
Ossa and Pelion, ii. 285.
Ostracism, similarity of, to Solon's condemnation of neutrality in sedition, iii. 197, 202 *seq.*, vii. 146 *seq.*; of Hyperbolus, iv. 202, vii. 145 *seq.*; of Kimon, v. 495; of Thucydidês, son of Melêsias, vi. 27; pro-

jected contention of, between Nikias and Alkibiadês, vii. 144 *seq.*; at Syracuse, vii. 166.
Otanês, iv. 301, 335 *seq.*, 373.
Othryadês, ii. 605.
Othrys, ii. 283 *seq.*
Otos and Ephialtês, i. 186.
Ovid at Tomi, xii. 641 *n.* 2.
Oxus crossed by Alexander, xii. 272.
Oxylus, i. 209, ii. 5, 12.
Oxythemis Korônæus, ii. 447 *n.* 2.

P.

Pachês, at Mitylênê, vi. 306, 321 *seq.*; at Notium, vi. 328; pursues the fleet of Alkidas to Patmos, vi. 327; sends Mitylenæan prisoners to Athens, vi. 330; crimes and death of, vi. 350.
Pæonians, iv. 19; conquest of, by Megabazus, iv. 372; victory of Philip over, xi. 302.
Pagasæ, conquest of, by Philip, xi. 412; importance of the Gulf of, to Philip, xi. 424.
Pagondas, vi. 523 *seq.*
Paktyas, the Lydian, iv. 269 *seq.*
Palæmon and Inô, i. 170.
Palæphatus, his treatment of mythes, i. 557 *seq.*
Palamêdês, i. 400.
Palikê, foundation of, vii. 168.
Palladium, capture of, i. 410.
Pallakopas, xii. 337.
Pallas, i. 8, 10.
Pallas, son of Pandiôn, i. 281.
Pallênê, i. 423, iv. 31, 32.
Palus Mæotis, tribes east of, iii. 329.
Pamnenes, expedition of, to Megalopolis, x. 494, xi. 361, 418.
Pamphyli, Hylleis, and Dymanes, ii. 486.
Pamphylia, conquest of, by Alexander, xii. 134.
Panaktum, vii. 36, 40.
Pan-Arcadian Ten Thousand, x. 317, 442.
Pan-Arcadian union, x. 283 *seq.*, 441 *seq.*
Pandiôn, i. 269.
Pandiôn, son of Phineus, i. 273.
Pandiôn II., i. 279.
Pandôra, i. 97, 103 *seq.*
Pan-Hellenic proceeding, the earliest approach to, iv. 70; feeling, growth of, between B.C. 776–560, iv. 71; character of the four great games, iv. 90; congress at the Isthmus of Corinth, v. 78 *seq.*; patriotism of the Athenians on Xerxes's invasion, v. 85; union under Sparta after the repulse of Xerxes, v. 353; schemes and sentiment of Periklês, vi. 25; pretences of Alexander, xii. 69.
Pan-Ionic festival and Amphiktyony in Asia, iii. 239.
Panoptês, Argos, i. 115.
Pantaleôn, ii. 585.
Panlikæum, xii. 648 *seq.*, 659.
Pantitês, story of, v. 129 *n.* 2.
Paphlagonia, submission of, to Alexander, xii. 149.
Paphlagonians, and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 196.
Paragraphê, viii. 410.
Parali, at Samos, viii. 39.
Paralii, iii. 127.
Paralus, arrival of, at Athens from Samos, viii. 40.
Paranomôn, Graphê, v. 507 *seq.*, viii. 48.
Parasang, length of, ix. 19 *n.* 3.
Paris, i. 390 *seq.*, 408.
Parisades I., xii. 652.
Parmenidês, viii. 468. 471 *n.*
Parmenio, embassy of, from Philip to Athens, xi. 535, 537, 541, 551, 555; operations of, in Asia Minor against Memnon, xii. 65; debate of, with Alexander at Milêtus, xii. 124; captures Damascus, xii. 173; at the battle of Arbela, xii. 214, 215, 222, 224; invested with the chief command at Ekbatana, xii. 245; family of, xii. 258; alleged conspiracy and assassination of, xii. 265 *seq.*
Paropamisadæ, subjugation of, by Alexander, xii. 270.
Paros, Theramenês at, viii. 159.
Partheniæ, iii. 519.
Parthenon, vi. 29, 31; records of offerings in, xi. 349 *n.*, 354 *n.* 3.
Parthia, Darius pursued by Alexander into, xii. 247 *seq.*
Partition of lands ascribed to Lykurgus, ii. 512, 530 *seq.*, 541 *seq.*; proposed by Agis, iii. 540, 543.
Parysatis, wife of Darius Nothus, ix. 81, 97.
Parysatis, daughter of Darius Nothus, xii. 324.
Pasimêlus, ix. 460 *seq.*
Pasion and Xenias, ix. 37.
Pasiphaë and the Minôtaur, i. 301.
Pasippidas, banishment of, viii. 173.
Patizeithês, conspiracy of, iv. 299.
Patrokleidês, amnesty proposed by, viii. 305.
Patroklus, treatment of, in the Iliad, ii. 238.
Patronymic names of demes, iii. 86 *n.*
Patrôus Apollo, i. 67.
Pattala, xii. 316 *n.* 4.
Pausanias, the historian, on the Achæans, i. 143; his view of mythes, i. 557; his history of the Bœotians between the siege of Troy and the Return of the Hêrakleids, ii. 22; his account of the Messenian wars, ii. 570 *seq.*, 576 *seq.*; on Iphikrates at Corinth, B.C. 369, x. 326 *n.*
Pausanias, the Spartan regent, at the Isthmus of Corinth, v. 213; at Platæa, v. 220 *seq.*, 232 *seq.*; misconduct of, after the battle of Platæa, v. 344 *seq.*, 346; conduct of, after losing the command of the Greeks, v. 363; detection and death of, v. 367 *seq.*; and Themistoklês, v. 370, 383.
Pausanias, the Spartan king, and Lysander, viii. 358; his expedition to Attica, viii. 375 *seq.*; his attack upon Peiræus, viii.

378; his pacification between the Ten at Athens and the exiles at Peiræus, viii. 379 *seq.*; in Bœotia, ix. 411 *seq.*; condemnation of, ix. 413 *seq.*; and the democratical leaders of Mantinea, x. 49.
Pausanias, the Macedonian, x. 341, xi. 710 *seq.*
Pedaritus, vii. 539, 541, viii. 26.
Pedieis, iii. 127.
Pedigrees, mythical, connect *gentes*, i. 260.
Pegasus, i. 10, 168.
Peiræum, Athenian victory near, vii. 508; defeat of the Athenian fleet near, vii. 524; capture of, by Agesilaus, ix. 476, 478 *seq.*; recovery of, by Iphikrates, ix. 490.
Peiræus, fortification of, by Themistoklês, v. 337 *seq.*; and Athens, Long Walls between, v. 440 *seq.*, viii. 311, ix. 448 *seq.*; improvements at, under Periklês, vi. 28; departure of the armament for Sicily from, vii. 243; walls built at, by the Four Hundred, viii. 86; approach of the Lacedæmonian fleet under Agesandridas to, viii. 91, 96; Thrasyllus at, viii. 366 *seq.*; king Pausanias's attack upon, viii. 378; attack of Teleutias on, ix. 522 *seq.*; attempt of Sphodrias to surprise, x. 133 *seq.*; seizure of, by Nikanor, xii. 467.
Peisander, and the mutilation of the Hermæ, vii. 270; and the conspiracy of the Four Hundred, viii. 11, 16, 18 *seq.*, 27 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 45 *seq.*; statements respecting, viii. 44 *n.*; punishment of, viii. 119.
Peisander, the Lacedæmonian admiral, ix. 380, 392.
Peisistratids and Thucydidês, iv. 146 *n.* 1; fall of the dynasty of, iv. 165; with Xerxes in Athens, v. 158 *seq.*
Peisistratus, iii. 208 *seq.*, iv. 137 *seq.*, 159.
Peithias, the Korkyræan, vi. 362 *seq.*
Pelasgi, ii. 350 *seq.*; in Italy, iii. 469; of Lemnos and Imbros, iv. 374.
Pelasgikon, oracle about the, vi. 175 *n.* 2.
Pelasgus, i. 238.
Pêleus, i. 157, 253 *seq.*
Pelias, i. 149 *seq.*, 157 *seq.*
Pelion and Ossa, ii. 285.
Pella, embassies from Grecian states at, B.C. 346, xi. 560 *seq.*; under Philip, xii. 89.
Pellênê, i. 423; and Phlius, x. 371.
Pelopidas, escape of, to Athens, x. 82; conspiracy of, against the philo-Laconian rulers at Thebes, x. 111 *seq.*; slaughter of Leontiades by, x. 118; and Epaminondas, x. 163; victory of, at Tegyra, x. 182; in Thessaly, x. 340, 360, 361, 387 *seq.*, 415, 420 *seq.*; and Philip, x. 340 *n.* 2, 361; and Alexander of Pheræ, x. 387 *seq.*; death of, x. 422.
Pelopids, i. 210 *seq.*, 220.
Peloponnesian war, its injurious effects upon the Athenian empire, vi. 64; war, commencement of, vi. 103–206; fleet, Phormio's victories over, vi. 265 *seq.*, 275 *seq.*; war, agreement of the Peloponnesian confederacy at the commencement of, vii. 26 *n.*; allies, synod of, at Corinth, B.C. 412, vii. 506; fleet under Theramenês, vii. 533 *seq.*; fleet at Rhodes, vii. 549 *seq.*, viii. 126; fleet, return of, from Rhodes to Milêtus, viii. 34; fleet, discontent in, at Milêtus, viii. 128, 130 *seq.*; fleet, capture of, at Kyzicus, viii. 163; fleet, pay of, by Cyrus, viii. 194; confederacy, assembly of, at Sparta, B.C. 404, viii. 311; confederacy, Athens at the head of, B.C. 371, x. 274; allies of Sparta after the Peloponnesian war, xi. 392.
Peloponnesians, immigrant, ii. 408; conduct of, after the battle of Thermopylæ, v. 145; and Mardonius's approach, v. 207 *seq.*; and the fortification of Athens, v. 329 *seq.*, 335; five years' truce of, with Athens, v. 453; position and views of, in commencing the Peloponnesian war, vi. 128 *seq.*, 152, 167 *seq.*; invasions of Attica by, under Archidamus, vi. 170 *seq.*, 208; slaughter of neutral prisoners by, vi. 245; and Ambrakiots attack Akarnania, vi. 261 *seq.*; application of revolted Mitylenæans to, vi. 306 *seq.*; and Ætolians attack Naupaktus, vi. 407; and Tissaphernês, vii. 518, 543 *seq.*, viii. 6, 31 *seq.*, 153 *seq.*, defeat of, at Kynossêma, viii. 147 *seq.*; at Abydos, viii. 157; aid of Pharnabazus to, viii. 170; letters of Philip to, xi. 680.
Peloponnesus, eponym of, i. 210; invasion and division of, by the Hêrakleids, ii. 6; mythical title of the Dorians to, ii. 8; extension of Pindus through, ii. 284; distribution of, about B.C. 450, ii. 401 *seq.*; difference between the distribution, B.C. 450 and 776, ii. 406; population of, which was believed to be indigenous, ii. 407; southern, inhabitants of, before the Dorian invasion, ii. 451; events in, during the first twenty years of the Athenian hegemony, v. 427 *seq.*; voyage of Tolmidês round, v. 450; ravages of, by the Athenians, vi. 182, 221; political relations in, B.C. 421, vii. 32; expedition of Alkibiadês into the interior of, vii. 86; expedition of Konon and Pharnabazus to, ix. 446; circumnavigation of, by Timotheus, x. 179; proceedings in, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 269, 331; expeditions of Epaminondas to, x. 294 *seq.*, 348 *seq.*, 364 *seq.*, 451 *seq.*; state of, B.C. 362, x. 429 *seq.*; visits of Dion to, xi. 85; disunion of, B.C. 360–359, xi. 282; affairs of, B.C. 354–352, xi. 405 *seq.*; war in, B.C. 352–351, xi. 418; intervention of Philip in, after B.C. 346, xi. 612; expedition of Philip to, xi. 704; Kassander and Polysperchon in, xii. 486, 493; Kassander and Alexander, son of Polysperchon, in, xii. 497, 499.
Pelops, i. 210 *seq.*
Pelusium, Alexander at, xii. 198.
Penal procedure at Athens, iv. 494 *n.*
Penestæ, Thessalian, ii. 373 *seq.*
Pentakosiomedimni, iii. 159.

Pentapolis on the south-west coast of the Euxine, xii. 620, 639.
Pentekontêrs, Spartan, ii. 619.
Pentekostys, ii. 619.
Penthesileia, i. 287, 404.
Pentheus and Agavè, i. 355 *seq.*
Perdikkas I., iv. 21.
Perdikkas II., relations and proceedings of, towards Athens, vi. 93 *seq.*, 98, 191, 502, 613 *seq.*, vii. 131, 141; and Sitalkês, vi. 289, 293; application of, to Sparta, vi. 502; and Brasidas, relations between, vi. 545, 600, 604 *seq.*; joins Sparta and Argos, vii. 131; death of, x. 61.
Perdikkas, brother of Philip, x. 411, 412, 510, 526, xi. 291 *seq.*
Perdikkas, Alexander's general, xii. 344, 430, 448 *seq.*, 453.
Pergamum, i. 389 *n.* 4, 438.
Pergamus, custom in the temple of Asklêpius at, i. 409 *n.* 1.
Pergamus in Mysia, the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 237 *seq.*
Periander, the Corinthian despot, power and character of, iii. 55 *seq.*
Periklês, difference between the democracy after, and the constitution of Kleisthenês, iv. 198; effect of, on constitutional morality, iv. 217; at the battle of Tanagra, v. 446; expeditions of, to Sikyon and Akarnania, v. 450; policy of, B.C. 450, v. 463; reconquest of Eubœa by, v. 473; and Ephialtês, constitution of dikasteries by, v. 481 *seq.*; and Kimon, v. 490 *seq.*; public life and character of, v. 490 *seq.*; and Ephialtês, judicial reform of, v. 481 *seq.*, 496 *seq.*; real nature of the constitutional changes effected by, v. 496 *seq.*; commencement of the ascendency of, v. 500; and Kimon, compromise between, v. 447, 501; his conception of the relation between Athens and her allies, vi. 5; and Athenian kleruchs by, vi. 14; and Thucydidês, son of Melêsias, vi. 21 *seq.*; Pan-Hellenic schemes and sentiment of, vi. 25; city-improvements at Athens under, vi. 27 *seq.*, 32 *seq.*; sculpture at Athens under, vi. 30; attempt of, to convene a Grecian congress at Athens, vi. 34; Sophoklês, &c., Athenian armament under, vi. 37 *seq.*; funeral orations of, vi. 42, 192 *seq.*; demand of the Spartans for his banishment, vi. 132, 142; indirect attacks of his political opponents upon, vi. 133 *seq.*; his family relations, and connexion with Aspasia, vi. 136, 138; charge of peculation against, vi. 139 *seq.*; stories of his having caused the Peloponnesian war, vi. 141 *n.*; speech of, before the Peloponnesian war, vi. 145 *seq.*; and the ravages of Attica by Archidamus, vi. 173 *seq.*; last speech of, vi. 223 *seq.*; accusation and punishment of, vi. 227 *seq.*; old age and death of, vi. 229 *seq.*; life and character of, vi. 232 *seq.*; new class of politicians at Athens after, vi. 331 *seq.*; and Nikias compared, vi. 387.
Periklymenos, i. 151 *seq.*
Perinthus, iv. 36; and Athens, viii. 170, xi. 637; siege of, by Philip, xi. 629, 634.
Periœki, ii. 490 *seq.*, 500, 501 *n.* 2; Libyan, iv. 54, 56, 60.
Pêrô, Bias and Melampus, i. 150 *seq.*
Perseid dynasty, i. 125.
Persephonê, i. 13; mysteries of, v. 282 *n.*
Persepolis, Alexander's march from Susa to, xii. 231 *seq.*; Alexander at, xii. 234 *seq.*, 319; Alexander's return from India to, xii. 319.
Persês, i. 8.
Perseus, exploits of, i. 123 *seq.*
Persia, application of Athens for alliance with, iv. 222; state of, on the formation of the confederacy of Delos, v. 362; treatment of Themistoklês in, v. 386 *seq.*; operations of Athens and the Delian confederacy against, v. 410 *seq.*; and Athens, treaty between, B.C. 450, v. 455 *seq.*; Asiatic Greeks not tributary to, between B.C. 477 and 412, v. 458 *n.*; surrender of the Asiatic Greeks by Sparta to, ix. 284; and the peace of Antalkidas, ix. 534 *seq.*, x. 2 *seq.*, 213; applications of Sparta and Athens to, x. 7 *seq.*; hostility of, to Sparta after the battle of Ægospotami, x. 10; unavailing efforts of, to reconquer Egypt, x. 17; and Evagoras, x. 27 *seq.*; Spartan project against, for the rescue of the Asiatic Greeks, x. 59; application of Thebes to, x. 379 *seq.*; embassy from Athens to, B.C. 366, x. 401; state of, B.C. 362, x. 496, 504; alarm at Athens about, B.C. 354, xi. 398; projected invasion of, by Philip, xi. 705 *seq.*; correspondence of Demosthenes with, xii. 27 *seq.*; accumulation of royal treasures in, xii. 237 *n.* 3; roads in, xii. 244 *n.*
Persian version of the legend of Io, i. 117; noblemen, conspiracy of, against the false Smerdis, iv. 301 *seq.*; empire, organization of, by Darius Hystaspês, iv. 314 *seq.*; envoys to Macedonia, iv. 372; armament against Cyprus, iv. 394; force against Milêtus, iv. 404; fleet at Ladê, iv. 411; fleet, and Asiatic Greeks, iv. 415; armament under Datis, iv. 444 *seq.*, 466 *seq.*; fleet, before the battle of Salamis, v. 114 *seq.*, 133 *seq.*, 154, 163, 174, 175 *nn.*; army, march of, from Thermopylæ to Attica, v. 155 *seq.*; fleet at Salamis, v. 180 *seq.*; fleet after the battle of Salamis, v. 190, 200; army under Mardonius, v. 214 *seq.*; fleet at Mykalê, v. 260; army at Mykalê, v. 262; army, after the defeat at Mykalê, v. 268; war, effect of, upon Athenian political sentiment, v. 373; kings, from Xerxes to Artaxerxes Mnemon, vi. 492 *seq.*; cavalry, and the retreating Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 119 *seq.*; empire, distribution of, into satrapies and subsatrapies, ix. 290; preparations for maritime war against Sparta, B.C. 397, ix. 354, 374; king, Thebans obtain money from, xi. 421; forces in Phrygia on Alexander's landing, xii. 100, 105; Gates,

Alexander at, xii. 232; fleet and armies, hopes raised in Greece by, B.C. 334–331, xii. 372.
Persians, condition of, at the rise of Cyrus the Great, iv. 250; conquests of, under Cyrus the Great, iv. 280, 291 *seq.*; the first who visited Greece, iv. 346 *seq.*; conquest of Thrace by, under Darius Hystaspès, iv. 369; successes of, against the revolted coast of Asia Minor, iv. 390; attempts of, to disunite the Ionians at Ladê, iv. 405; narrow escape of Miltiadês from, iv. 415; cruelties of, at Milêtus, iv. 416; attempted revolt of Thasos from, iv. 424; at Marathon, iv. 450, 466 *seq.*; after the battle of Marathon, iv. 475, 476; change of Grecian feeling towards, after the battle of Marathon, iv. 479; their religious conception of history, v. 13; at Thermopylæ, v. 114, 117 *seq.*; in Psyttaleia, v. 175, 186; at Salamis, v. 180 *seq.*; at Platæa, v. 226 *seq.*; at Mykalê, v. 266; between Xerxes and Darius Codomannus, v. 326; necessity of Grecian activity against, after the battles of Platæa and Mykalê, v. 402; mutilation inflicted by, ix. 13; heralds from, to the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 77; impotence and timidity of, ix. 100; imprudence of, in letting Alexander cross the Hellespont, xii. 104; defeat of, at the Granikus, xii. 107 *seq.*; defeat of, at Issus, xii. 159 *seq.*; incorporation of, in the Macedonian phalanx, xii. 338.
Persis, subjugation of, by Alexander, xii. 240; Alexander's return from India to, xii. 319.
Personages, quasi-human, in Grecian mythology, i. 463 *seq.*
Personal ascendency of the king in legendary Greece, ii. 86; feeling towards the gods, the king, or individuals in legendary Greece, ii. 108 *seq.*; sympathies the earliest form of social existence, ii. 117.
Personalities, great predominance of, in Grecian legend, i. 102.
Personality of divine agents in mythes, i. 2.
Personification, tendency of the ancient Greeks to, i. 462 *seq.*; of the heavenly bodies by Boiocalus, the German chief, i. 466 *n.*
Pestilence and suffering at Athens after the Kylonian massacre, iii. 114.
Petalism at Syracuse, iv. 218, vii. 166.
Peukê, xii. 31, 33 *n.* 2.
Peukestes, xii. 315, 320.
Pezetæri, xii. 80.
Phœax, expedition of, to Sicily, vii. 194.
Phalækus succeeds to the command of the Phokians, xi. 421; decline of the Phokians under, xi. 519, 578; opposition to, in Phokis, xi. 520; opposition of, to aid from Athens to Thermopylæ, xi. 522; position of, at Thermopylæ, xi. 520, 578 *seq.*; death of, xi. 599.
Phalanthus, œkist of Tarentum, iii. 518 *seq.*
Phalanx, Macedonian, xi. 691, xii. 77 *seq.*, 338.
Phalaris, iv. 511, v. 276.
Phalêrum, Xerxes at, v. 163.
Phalînus, ix. 70.
Phanês and Zeus, i. 24.
Phanosthenês, viii. 217.
Pharakidas, x. 703 *seq.*
Pharax, ix. 374, 376 *n.* 3.
Pharax, the officer of Dionysius, xi. 161, 162, 188.
Pharis, conquest of, ii. 564.
Pharnabazus and Tissaphernês, embassy from, to Sparta, vii. 502; and Derkyllidas, viii. 127, 289, 298, 304, 353; and Athens, viii. 152, 170; Athenian victory over, viii. 176; convention of, about Chalkêdon, viii. 179; and Alkibiades, viii. 180, 426 *seq.*; and Greek envoys, viii. 183, 186; after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 426; and Anaxibius, ix. 211, 226; and Lysander, ix. 283; and the subsatrapy of Æolis, ix. 291 *seq.*; and Agesilaus, ix. 363, 380 *seq.*; and Konon, ix. 391, 442, 446 *seq.*; and Abydos, ix. 444; and the anti-Spartan allies at Corinth, ix. 447; and the Syracusans, x. 533; anti-Macedonian efforts of, xii. 172; capture of, with his force, at Chios, xii. 192.
Pharsalus, Polydamas of, x. 186 *seq.*; and Halus, xi. 569.
Phasêlis, Alexander at, xii. 134.
Phayllus, xi. 409, 415 *seq.*, 421.
Pheidias, vi. 31, 139.
Pheidôn the Temenid, ii. 423; claims and projects of, as representative of Hêraklês, ii. 425; and the Olympic games, 426 *seq.*; coinage and scale of, ii. 428 *seq.*, 435 *seq.*; various descriptions of, ii. 431.
Pheidôn, one of the Thirty, viii. 371, 402.
Phenicia, ante-Hellenic colonies from, to Greece not probable, ii. 357; situation and cities of, iii. 358 *seq.*; reconquest of, by Darius Nothus, xi. 606, 609 *n.* 3; Alexander in, xii. 175 *seq.*, 203.
Phenician version of the legend of Io, i. 118; colonies, iii. 365 *seq.*; fleet at Aspendus, viii. 134, 136, 154; towns, surrender of, to Alexander, xii. 175, 178.
Phenicians in Homeric times, ii. 139 *seq.*; historical, iii. 356, 389, 407, 412, 457 *seq.*; and Persians, subjugation of Cyprus by, iv. 394; and Persians at Milêtus, iv. 404 *seq.*; and Persians, reconquest of Asiatic Greeks by, iv. 415; and the cutting through Athos, v. 32; and Greeks in Sicily, v. 280; in Cyprus, x. 19 *seq.*
Pheræ, Jason of, x. 187 *seq.*, x. 199 *n.*, 208, 257 *seq.*, 265 *seq.*
Pheræ, Alexander of, x. 339, 340, xi. 287 *seq.*; despots of, xi. 286 *seq.*; Philip and the despots of, xi. 366, 408, 410 *seq.*; Philip takes the oath of alliance with Athens at, xi. 567; Alexander of, and Pelopidas, 360, 387 *seq.*, 415, 420 *seq.*; Alexander of, subdued by the Thebans, x. 423 *seq.*; hostilities of Alexander of, against Athens, x. 509.

Pherekydēs, i. 525, iv. 526.
Pheretimē, iv. 61 *seq.*
Philæus, eponym of an Attic dēme, i. 259.
Philaidæ, origin of, i. 259.
Philip of Macedon, detained as a hostage at Thebes, x. 340 *n.* 2, 361, xi. 293 *seq.*; accession of, x. 526, xi. 300 *seq.*; as subordinate governor in Macedonia, xi. 292, 294; position of, on the death of Perdikkas, xi. 296; capture of Amphipolis by, xi. 326 *seq.*; his alliance with Olynthus and hostilities against Athens, xi. 332 *seq.*; capture of Pydna and Potidæa by, xi. 333 *seq.*; increased power of, B.C. 358–356, xi. 336; marriage of, with Olympias, xi. 337; intrigue of, with Kersobleptes against Athens, xi. 362; his activity, and conquest of Methōnē, xi. 363 *seq.*; and the despots of Pheræ, xi. 366, 408 *seq.*; development of Macedonian military force under, xi. 395 *seq.*; and Onomarchus, xi. 409, 410; conquest of Pheræ and Pagasæ by, xi. 412; checked at Thermopylæ by the Athenians, xi. 413; power and attitude of, B.C. 352–351, xi. 422; naval power and operations of, B.C. 351, xi. 414 *seq.*; in Thrace, B.C. 351, xi. 421; hostility of, to Olynthus, B.C. 351–350, xi. 447; flight of his half-brothers to Olynthus, xi. 449; intrigues of, in Olynthus, xi. 449; destruction of the Olynthian confederacy by, xi. 452, 454, 462, 488 *seq.*, 505; Athenian expedition to Olynthus against, xi. 467; intrigues of, in Eubœa, xi. 473; and Athens, overtures for peace between, B.C. 348, xi. 512 *seq.*; Thebans invoke the aid of, against the Phokians, xi. 520; and Thermopylæ, xi. 524, 564, 568, 576, 582, 586; embassies from Athens to, xi. 520 *seq.*, 556 *seq.*, 583; envoys to Athens from, xi. 535, 537, 541, 551, 555; synod of allies at Athens about, xi. 538; peace and alliance between Athens and, xi. 541 *seq.*, 567, 593 *seq.*, 611, 616 *seq.*; fabrications of Æschines and Philokrates about, xi. 551, 565, 566, 570 *seq.*; in Thrace, xi. 557, 559, 622 *seq.*; letter of, taken by Æschines to Athens, xi. 568, 575; surrender of Phokis to, xi. 582; declared sympathy of, with the Thebans, B.C. 346, xi. 582; visit of Æschines to, in Phokis, xi. 585; admitted into the Amphiktyonic assembly, xi. 588; ascendency of, B.C. 346, xi. 591 *seq.*; named president of the Pythian festival, xi. 592; position of, after the Sacred War, xi. 601; letter of Isokratēs to, xi. 603; movements of, after B.C. 346, xi. 612 *seq.*; warnings of Demosthenēs against, after B.C. 346, xi. 614. mission of Python from, to Athens, xi. 616; and Athens, dispute between, about Halonnesus, xi. 618 *seq.*; and Kardia, xi. 623; and Athens, disputes between, about the Bosphorus and Hellespont, xi. 623; at Perinthus and the Chersonese, xi. 629, 634 *seq.*; and Athens, declaration of war between, xi. 629 *seq.*; makes peace with Byzantium, Chios, and other islands, attacks the Scythians, and is defeated by the Triballi, xi. 638; and the Amphissians, xi. 664 *seq.*, 687; re-fortification of Elateia by, xi. 667, 670 *seq.*; application of, to Thebes for aid in attacking the Athenians, xi. 668 *seq.*, 676; alliance of Athens and Thebes against, xi. 677 *seq.*, 681 *seq.*; letters of, to the Peloponnesians for aid, xi. 680; victory of, at Chæroneia, xi. 687 *seq.*, 697; military organization of, xi. 691, 692, xii. 77 *seq.*; and the Athenians, peace of Demades between, xi. 699 *seq.*; honorary votes at Athens in favour of, xi. 702; expedition of, into Peloponnesus, xi. 704; at the congress at Corinth, xi. 705; preparations of, for the invasion of Persia, xi. 707; repudiates Olympias, and marries Kleopatra, xi. 707; and Alexander, dissensions between, xi. 708; assassination of, xi. 709 *seq.*, xii. 8 *seq.*; character of, xi. 716 *seq.*; discord in the family of, xii. 5; military condition of Macedonia before, xii. 75.
Philip Aridæus, xii. 429, 430, 450.
Philippi, foundation of, xi. 337.
Philippics of Demosthenes, xi. 431 *seq.*, 615, 624.
Philippising factions in Megara and Eubœa, xi. 621.
Philippus, the Theban polemarch, x. 113, 116, 117.
Philippus, Alexander's physician, xii. 152.
Philiskus, x. 357.
Philistides, xi. 621, 626.
Philistus, his treatment of mythes, i. 551; banishment of, xi. 46; recall of, xi. 91; intrigues of, against Plato and Dion, xi. 105; tries to intercept Dion in the Gulf of Tarentum, xi. 124; at Leontini, xi. 138; defeat and death of, xi. 139.
Philokrates, motion of, to allow Philip to send envoys to Athens, xi. 514; motion of, to send envoys to Philip, xi. 526; motions of, for peace and alliance with Philip, xi. 541 *seq.*, 575; fabrications of, about Philip, xi. 551, 565, 566, 570; impeachment and condemnation of, xi. 598.
Philoktētēs, i. 408, 421.
Philolaus and Dioklēs, ii. 398.
Philomēla, i. 269 *seq.*
Philomelus, xi. 344; seizes the temple at Delphi, xi. 348; and Archidamus, xi. 347; and the Pythia at Delphi, xi. 351; successful battles of, with the Lokrians, xi. 352; defeat and death of, xi. 357; takes part of the treasures in the temple at Delphi, xi. 354.
Philonomus and the Spartan Dorians, ii. 440.
Philosophers, mythes allegorised by, i. 562 *seq.*
Philosophy, Homeric and Hesiodic, i. 495; Ionic, i. 502 *n.* 2; ethical and social, among the Greeks, iv. 129.
Philotas, alleged conspiracy, and execution of, xii. 258 *seq.*, 267 *n.* 2.

Philoxenus and Dionysius, xi. 30.
Phineus, i. 273, 321.
Phlegyæ, the, i. 175.
Phlius, return of philo-Laconian exiles to, x. 56; intervention of Sparta with, x. 95; surrender of, to Agesilaus, x. 96 *seq.*; application of, to Athens, x. 320 *seq.*; fidelity of, to Sparta, x. 351, 370; invasion of, by Euphron, x. 370; and Pellênê, x. 371; assistance of Chares to, x. 372; and Thebes, x. 398 *seq.*
Phœbê, i. 6, 8.
Phœbidas, at Thebes, x. 79 *seq.*, 84, 86, 173.
Phœnissæ of Phrynichus, v. 188 *n.* 1.
Phœnix, i. 350.
Phôkæa, foundation of, iii. 254; surrender of, to Harpagus, iv. 274; Alkibiadês at, viii. 208.
Phôkæan colonies at Alalia and Elea, iv. 277.
Phôkæans, exploring voyages of, iii. 377; effects of their exploring voyages upon Grecian knowledge and fancy, iii. 379; emigration of, iv. 276 *seq.*
Phokian defensive wall at Thermopylæ, ii. 379; townships, ravage of, by Xerxes's army, v. 155.
Phokians, ii. 386; application of Leonidas to, v. 105; at Leuktra, x. 245, 247; and the presidency of the temple at Delphi, xi. 344 *seq.*; Thebans strive to form a confederacy against, xi. 353; take the treasures in the temple at Delphi, xi. 354, 358, 415, 519; war of, with the Lokrians, Thebans, and Thessalians, xi. 356; under Onomarchus, xi. 366, 409; under Phayllus, xi. 415 *seq.*; under Phalækus, xi. 519, 578; Thebans invoke the aid of Philip against, xi. 520; application of, to Athens, xi. 522; exclusion of, from the peace and alliance between Philip and Athens, xi. 549 *seq.*, 569; envoys from, to Philip, xi. 560, 565; motion of Philokrates about, xi. 575; at Thermopylæ, xi. 578 *seq.*; treatment of, after their surrender to Philip, xi. 588 *seq.*; restoration of, by the Thebans and Athenians, xi. 681.
Phokion, first exploits of, x. 178; character and policy of, xi. 381 *seq.*, 430, xii. 374, 419, 482 *seq.*; in Eubœa, xi. 475 *seq.*, 626; at Megara, xi. 621; in the Propontis, xi. 636; and Alexander's demand that the anti-Macedonian leaders at Athens should be surrendered, xii. 61, 63; and Demades, embassy of, to Antipater, xii. 434; at Athens under Antipater, xii. 446; and Nikanor, xii. 457, 466 *seq.*; and Alexander, son of Polysperchon, xii. 470; condemnation and death of, xii. 471 *seq.*; altered sentiment of the Athenians towards, after his death, xii. 481.
Phokis, acquisition of, by Athens, v. 449; loss of, by Athens, v. 472; invasion of, by the Thebans, B.C. 374, x. 184; accusation of Thebes against, before the Amphiktyonic assembly, xi. 342; resistance of, to the Amphiktyonic assembly, xi. 343 *seq.*; Philip in, xi. 582, 667, 680 *seq.*
Phôkus, i. 254.
Phokylidês, iv. 124.
Phorkys and Kêtô, progeny of, i. 10.
Phormio at Potidæa, vi. 101; at Amphilochian Argos, vi. 164; at Naupaktus, vi. 244; his victories over the Peloponnesian fleet, vi. 265 *seq.*, 275 *seq.*; in Akarnania, vi. 283; his later history, vi. 375 *n.* 2.
Phormisius, disfranchising proposition of, viii. 403.
Phorôneus, i. 113, 114.
Phraortês, iii. 312.
Phratriês, iii. 73 *seq.*, 88; and gentes, non-members of, iii. 178.
Phrikônis, iii. 260.
Phrygia, Persian forces in, on Alexander's landing, xii. 100, 105; submission of, to Alexander, xii. 119.
Phrygian influence on the religion of the Greeks, i. 32, 38; music and worship, iii. 288 *seq.*
Phrygians and Trojans, i. 452; and Thracians, iii. 284, 289; ethnical affinities and early distribution of, iii. 282 *seq.*
Phrynichus the tragedian, his capture of Milêtus, iv. 418; his Phœnissæ, v. 188 *n.* 1.
Phrynichus the commander, at Milêtus, vii. 534; and Amorgês, vii. 535 *n.* 1; and Alkibiadês, viii. 13 *seq.*; deposition of, viii. 20; and the Four Hundred, 25, 85 *seq.*; assassination of, viii. 90, 114 *n.* 2; decree respecting the memory of, viii. 114.
Phrynon, xi. 513.
Phryxus and Hellê, i. 169 *seq.*
Phthiôtis and Deukalion, i. 133.
Φύσις, first use of, in the sense of *nature*, i. 496.
Phyê-Athênê, iv. 140.
Phylarch, Athenian, ii. 620.
Phylê, occupation of, by Thrasybulus, viii. 362.
Phyllidas and the conspiracy against the philo-Laconian oligarchy at Thebes, x. 112 *seq.*
Physical astronomy thought impious by ancient Greeks, i. 468 *n.*; science, commencement of, among the Greeks, i. 495.
Phytalids, their tale of Dêmêtêr, i. 59.
Phyton, xi. 25 *seq.*
Pierians, original seat of, iv. 17.
Piété, Monts de, iii. 218.
Πῖλοι of the Lacedæmonians in Sphakteria, vi. 467 *n.*
Pinarus, Alexander and Darius on the, xii. 159 *seq.*
Pindar, his treatment of mythes, i. 509 *seq.*
Pindus, ii. 283 *seq.*
Piracy in early Greece, ii. 122, 152.
Pisa and Elis, relations of, ii. 591.
Pisatans and the Olympic games, ii. 427, 585, ix. 317, x. 436 *seq.*; and Eleians, ii. 585, 591.
Pisatic sovereignty of Pelops, i. 214.
Pisidia, conquest of, by Alexander, xii. 184.

Pissuthnes, vi. 37, 38, ix. 4.
Pitanê, iii. 258.
Pittakus, power and merit of, iii. 268 *seq.*
Plague at Athens, vi. 209 *seq.*; revival of, vi. 396.
Platæa, and Thebes, disputes between, iv. 223; and Athens, first connexion of, iv. 223; battle of, v. 220 *seq.*; revelation of the victory of, at Mykalê the same day, v. 262; night-surprise of, by the Thebans, vi. 153 *seq.*; siege of, by Archidamus, vi. 250 *seq.*; surrender of, to the Lacedæmonians, vi. 352 *seq.*; restoration of, by Sparta, x. 40 *seq.*; capture of, by the Thebans, x. 215 *seq.*
Platæans at Marathon, iv. 465.
Plato, his treatment of mythes, i. 591 *seq.*; on the return of the Hêrakleids, ii. 8; on homicide, ii. 129 *n.*; his Republic and the Lykurgean institutions, ii. 526; and the Sophists, viii. 481–544; and Xenophon, evidence of, about Sokratês, viii. 555 *seq.*, 609 *n.*, 616 *n.*; his extension and improvement of the formal logic founded by Sokratês, viii. 589; purpose of his dialogues, viii. 621; incorrect assertions in the Menexenus of, ix. 499 *n.*; the letters of, x. 602 *n.* 2; and Dionysius the Elder, xi. 52, 83; and Dion, xi. 53, 79 *seq.*, 95, 116; and Dionysius the Younger, xi. 72, 95–111; Dion, and the Pythagoreans, xi. 78 *seq.*; statements and advice of, on the condition of Syracuse, xi. 183 *seq.*; and the kings of Macedonia, xi. 291.
Plausible fiction, i. 583, ii. 70.
Pleistoanax, v. 472, vi. 586 *seq.*
Plemmyrium, vii. 370, 401 *seq.*
Plutarch and Lykurgus, ii. 455, 463, 543 *seq.*; on the ephor Epitadeus, ii. 547; and Herodotus, iv. 272 *n.*, v. 8 *n.* 2; on Periklês, vi. 234.
Plutarch of Eretria, xi. 474 *seq.*
Plyntéria, viii. 196.
Podaleirius and Machaôn, i. 248.
Podarkês, birth of, i. 151.
Poems, lost epic, ii. 162; epic, recited in public, not read in private, ii. 182.
Poetry, Greek, transition of, from the mythical past to the positive present, i. 488; epic, ii. 158 *seq.*; epic, Homeric and Hesiodic, ii. 160; didactic and mystic hexameter, ii. 161; lyric and choric, intended for the ear, ii. 184; Greek, advances of, within a century and a half after Terpander, iv. 104.
Poets inspired by the Muse, i. 479; iambic, elegiac, and lyric, predominance of the present in, i. 490; and logographers, their treatment of mythes, i. 509 *seq.*; early, chronological evidence of, ii. 60 *seq.*; epic, and their probable dates, ii. 164; cyclic, ii. 165 *seq.*; gnomic or moralising, iv. 122 *seq.*
Polemarch, Athenian, iii. 100.
Polemarchs, Spartan, ii. 619.
Polemarchus, viii. 338.
Political clubs at Athens, viii. 21.
Politicians, new class of, at Athens, after Periklês, vi. 331 *seq.*
Pollis, defeat of, by Chabrias, x. 176.
Pollux and Castor, i. 231 *seq.*
Polyarchus, xi. 218.
Polybiades, x. 92.
Polybius, his transformation of mythes to history, i. 554; perplexing statement of, respecting the war between Sybaris and Kroton, iv. 561; the Greece of, xii. 528.
Polycharês and Euæpinus, ii. 573.
Polydamas of Pharsalus, x. 186 *seq.*
Polydamas the Macedonian, xii. 266.
Polydamidas at Mendê, vi. 601 *seq.*
Polykratês of Samos, iv. 323 *seq.*
Polykratês the Sophist, harangue of, on the accusation against Sokratês, viii. 645 *n.*
Polynikês, i. 364, 366 *seq.*, 372, 380.
Polyphron, x. 339.
Polysperchon, appointed by Antipater as his successor, xii. 457; plans of, xii. 458; edict of, at Pella, xii. 462 *seq.*; Phokion and Agnonides heard before, xii. 473 *seq.*; and Kassander, xii. 486, 502, 515; flight of, to Ætolia, xii. 496.
Polystratus, one of the Four Hundred, viii. 93 *n.* 1, 94 *n.*, 106, 119.
Polyxena, death of, i. 413.
Polyzêlus and Hiero, v. 306.
Pompey in Colchis, i. 331.
Pontic Greeks, xii. 620 *seq.*
Pontic Herakleia, xii. 622–638.
Pontus and Gæa, children of, i. 9.
Popular belief in ancient mythes, i. 573, 576.
Porus, xii. 306 *seq.*
Poseidôn, i. 8, 9, 13, 76; prominence of, in Æolid legends, i. 147; Erechtheus, i. 263, 264; and Athênê, i. 266; and Laomedôn, i. 388.
Positive evidence indispensable to historical proof, i. 576.
Positive tendencies of the Greek mind in the time of Herodotus, iv. 141 *n.*
Post-Homeric poems on the Trojan war, i. 404.
Potidæa and Artabazus, v. 202; relations of, with Corinth and Athens, vi. 93; designs of Perdikkas and the Corinthians upon, vi. 94; revolt of, from Athens, vi. 95 *seq.*; Athenian victory near, vi. 100; blockade of, by the Athenians, vi. 101, 191, 222, 248; Brasidas's attempt upon, vi. 616; capture of, by Philip and the Olynthians, xi. 334.
Prasiæ, expedition of Pythodôrus to, vii. 392.
Praxitas, ix. 455 *n.* 2, 463 *seq.*
Priam, i. 389, 397 *n.* 3, 412.
Priênê, iii. 233, 241, vi. 36.
Priests, Egyptian, iii. 421.
Primitive and historical Greece, ii. 82–159.
Private property, rights of, at Athens, viii. 416.
Probability alone not sufficient for historical proof, i. 575.

Pro-Bouleutic Senate, Solon's, iii. 164.
Probúli, board of, vii. 498.
Prodikus, viii. 502, 515 *seq.*
Prœtos and his daughters, i. 121 *seq.*
Prokné, i. 269 *seq.*
Prokris, i. 271.
Promêtheus, i. 8; and Zeus, i. 85, 86, 103, 107 *seq.*; and Pandôra, i. 97; and Epimêtheus, i. 102; Æschylus's, i. 316 *n.*
Property, rights of, at Athens, iii. 144, 153 *seq.*
Prophecies, Sibylline, i. 457.
Propontis, Phokion in, xi. 636.
Propylæa, building of, vi. 29, 33 *n.* 1.
Prose writing among the Greeks, iv. 130.
Protagoras, viii. 498, 503 *seq.*, 518 *seq.*, 523 *n.*
Protesilaus, i. 398, v. 271.
Prothoüs, x. 238.
Proxenus of Tegea, x. 285.
Prytaneium, Solon's regulations about, iii. 192.
Prytanes, iv. 185.
Prytanies, iv. 185.
Prytanis, xii. 656.
Psammenitus, iv. 296.
Psammetichus I., iii. 434 *seq.*
Psammetichus and Tamos, x. 17.
Psammis, iii. 446.
Psephism, Demophantus's democratical, viii. 109.
Psephisms and laws, distinctions between, v. 504.
Psyttaleia, Persian troops in, v. 175, 186.
Ptolemy of Alôrus, x. 341, 342; and Pelopidas, x. 361; assassination of, x. 411.
Ptolemy of Egypt, attack of Perdikkas on, xii. 452; alliance of, with Kassander, Lysimachus and Seleukus against Antigonus, xii. 496, 502, 517, 522; proclamations of, to the Greeks, xii. 498; Lysimachus and Kassander, pacification of, with Antigonus, xii. 501; in Greece, xii. 504.
Ptolemy, nephew of Antigonus, xii. 500.
Public speaking, its early origin and intellectual effects, ii. 105 *seq.*
Punjab, Alexander's conquests in the, xii. 306 *seq.*
Purification for homicide, i. 33, 34.
Pydna, siege of, by Archestratus, vi. 96; siege of, by Archelaus, viii. 159; and Philip, xi. 332, 333.
Pylæ, in Babylonia, ix. 48 *n.* 2, 54 *n.*
Pylagoræ, ii. 328.
Pylians, ii. 16, 451.
Pylus, attack of Hêraklês on, i. 152; long independence of, ii. 446 *n.*; occupation and fortification of, by the Athenians, vi. 425 *seq.*; armistice concluded at, vi. 439, 450; Kleon's expedition to, vi. 454 *seq.*; cession of, demanded by the Lacedæmonians, vii. 40; helots brought back to, by the Athenians, vii. 95; recapture of, by the Lacedæmonians, viii. 176.
Pyramids, Egyptian, iii. 429.
Pyrrha and Deukaliôn, i. 134.
Pyrrho and Sokratês, viii. 672 *n.*
Pyrrhus, son of Achilles, i. 258.
Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, and Antipater, son of Kassander, xii. 525.
Pythagoras, the philosopher, i. 495 *seq.*, iv. 527–553, 561.
Pythagoras, the Ephesian despot, iii. 246.
Pythagorean order, iv. 536, 543 *seq.*, 561.
Pythagoreans, logical distinction of genera and species unknown to, viii. 587 *n.* 2; Plato, and Dion, xi. 78 *seq.*
Pytheas, xii. 619.
Pythia, the, at Delphi, and Philomelus, xi. 351.
Pythian Apollo, i. 63, 64.
Pythian games, ii. 322, 336, iv. 79, 86 *seq.*, iv. 90, x. 185 *n.* 3, 266, xi. 592.
Pythius, the Phrygian, v. 37.
Pythodôrus, vii. 182, 190, 392.
Python, mission of, to Athens, xi. 616.
Pythonikus, vii. 239, 269.

Q.

Quadriremes, x. 667.
Quinqueremes, v. 65 *n.*, x. 667.

R.

Races of men in "Works and Days," i. 88 *seq.*
Religious ceremonies a source of myths, i. 85, 86, 610 *seq.*; views paramount in the Homeric age, i. 483; views, opposition of, to scientific, among the Greeks, i. 484, 499 *seq.*; festivals, Grecian, iv. 72, 91 *seq.*, xi. 493; associations, effect of, on early Grecian art, iv. 133.
Reply to criticisms on the first two volumes of this history, i. 548 *n.*
Rhadamanthus and Minôs, i. 299.
Rhapsodes, ii. 174, 185 *seq.*
Rhea, i. 6, 8.
Rhegians and Tarentines, expedition of, against the Iapygians, v. 323.
Rhegium, iii. 513; the chorus sent from Messênê to, iv. 73 *n.* 1; and Athens, vii. 175 *n.* 2; the Athenian fleet near, B.C. 425, vii. 183; progress of the Athenian armament for Sicily to, vii. 246; discouragement of the Athenians at, vii. 259; relations of, with Dionysius, B.C. 399, x. 660 *seq.*; and Dionysius, xi. 6, 9, 15, 22 *seq.*; and Dionysius the Younger, xi. 187; Timoleon at, xi. 203 *seq.*
Rhetoric, v. 540, viii. 462, 465, 473 *seq.*
Rhetors and sophists, v. 541 *seq.*
Rhetra, the primitive constitutional, ii. 465 *n.* 2, 467 *n.*
Rhetræ, the Three Lykurgean, ii. 479 *n.*
Rhianus and the second Messenian war, ii. 579.
Rhium, Phormio in the Gulf at, vi. 265 *seq.*
Rhodes, founder of, ii. 41; dikasteries at, v. 519 *n.* 2; and the Olympic games, vii. 72 *n.*; the Peloponnesian fleet at, vii. 549, 551 *seq.*, viii. 126, ix. 504, 511; Dorians

it, viii. 156; revolt of, from Sparta, ix. 375; revolt of, from Athens, xi. 310 *seq.*; siege of, by Demetrius Poliorketes, xii. 514.
Rhodians and the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 696.
Rhoddpis, iii. 451 *n.*
Rhœkus of Samos, iv. 132.
Rhœsakes, xii. 113.
Rites, post-Homeric, i. 35, 36; ecstatic, i. 39 *seq.*
Rivers, mythical personages identified with, i. 463 *n.* 2; of Greece, ii. 289.
Robbery, violent, how regarded in Greece and Europe, ii. 150 *n.*
Romances of chivalry, i. 635, ii. 209 *n.* 1.
Roman kings, authority of, ii. 94 *n.* 1.
Roman law of debtor and creditor, iii. 215 *seq.*
Romans, respect of, for Ilium, i. 442; belief of, with regard to earthquakes, i. 538 *n.*; dislike of, to paid judicial pleading, viii. 483 *n.*; embassy from, to Alexander, xii. 334 *n.* 2; Livy's opinion as to the chances of Alexander, if he had attacked the, xii. 350.
Rome, reduction of the rate of interest at, iii. 152 *n.*; debasement of coin at, iii. 155; new tables at, iii. 156 *n.* 2; law of debtor and creditor at, iii. 215 *seq.*; political associations at, viii. 22 *n.*; and Carthage, treaties between, x. 541 *n.*
Roxana, xii. 289, 290, 429, 449, 495, 501.

S.

Sacred games, Solon's rewards to victors at, iii. 191; objects, Greek view of material connexion with, iii. 114 *n.* 1, 351.
Sacred War, the first, iv. 84 *seq.*, v. 468; the second, xi. 339 *seq.*, 519, 582 *seq.*; position of Philip after the second, xi. 601; the third, xi. 646.
Sacrifices, i. 85; human, in Greece, i. 172 *seq.*
Sacrilege, French legislation upon, vii. 289 *n.*
Sadyattés, iii. 344.
Saga, the, Ampère on, i. 482.
Sage, a universal manifestation of the human mind, i. 618.
Sagen-poesie, applied as a standard to the Iliad and Odyssey, ii. 217.
Sagra, date of the battle at, iv. 554 *n.* 1.
Saints, legends of, i. 629 *seq.*
Sakadas, iv. 120.
Salæthus, vi. 321 *seq.*
Salamis, the serpent of, i. 255; war between Athens and Megara about, iii. 123 *seq.*; retreat of the Greek fleet from Artemisium to, v. 140, 147; the battle of, v. 144–198; Persian and Greek fleets after the battle of, v. 200; migration of Athenians to, on Mardonius's approach, v. 209; seizure of prisoners at, by the Thirty Tyrants at Athens, viii. 364.
Salamis in Cyprus, i. 259, x. 18 *seq.*
Salmoneus, i. 149.
Samian exiles, application of, to Sparta, iv. 328; attack of, on Siphnos, iv. 328; at Zanklê, v. 285 *seq.*
Samians and Athenians, contrast between, iv. 333; slaughter of, by Otanês, iv. 337; at Ladê, iv. 410; migration of, to Sicily, iv. 412; transfer of the fund of the confederacy from Delos to Athens proposed by, v. 465; application of, to Sparta for aid against Athens, vi. 41.
Samnites, xi. 11.
Samos, foundation of, iii. 233; condition of, on the accession of Darius Hystaspés, iv. 323; Lacedæmonians and Polykratês at, iv. 327; Persian armament under Datis at, iv. 444; Persian fleet at, after the battle of Salamis, v. 200, 260; Greek fleet moves to the rescue of, from the Persians, v. 259; an autonomous ally of Athens, vi. 2; revolt of, from the Athenians, vi. 35 *seq.*, 40; and Milêtus, dispute between, about Priênê, vi. 36; Athenian armament against, under Periklês, Sophoklês, &c., vi. 37 *seq.*; blockaded, vi. 39; government of, after its capture by Periklês, vi. 42; democratical revolution at, vii. 520 *seq.*; powerful Athenian fleet at, B.C. 412, vii. 537; oligarchical conspiracy at, viii. 8 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*; embassy from the Four Hundred to, viii. 60, 72 *seq.*, 77; Athenian democracy reconstituted at, viii. 62 *seq.*; the Athenian democracy at, and Alkibiadês, viii. 67 *seq.*; eagerness of the Athenian democracy at, to sail to Peiræus, viii. 71, 74; envoys from Argos to the Athenian Demos at, viii. 77; Athenian democracy at, contrasted with the oligarchy of the Four Hundred, viii. 123 *seq.*; Strombichidês's arrival at, from the Hellespont, viii. 129; Alkibiadês's return from Aspendus to, viii. 156; Alkibiadês sails from, to the Hellespont, viii. 158; Alkibiadês at, B.C. 407, viii. 206; Alkibiadês leaves Antiochus in command at, viii. 208; dissatisfaction of the armament at, with Alkibiadês, viii. 210; Konon at, viii. 218; Lysander at, viii. 303, 323; conquest of, by Timotheus, x. 403, 407 *n.*
Samothracians, exploit of, at Salamis, v. 184.
Sangala, capture of, by Alexander, xii. 310.
Sapphô, i. 490, iv. 120 *seq.*
Sardinia, proposition of Bias for a Pan-Ionic emigration to, iv. 279.
Sardis, iii. 298; capture of, by Cyrus, iv. 259; march of Aristagoras to, and burning of, iv. 391; march of Xerxes to, and collection of his forces at, v. 18; march of Xerxes from, v. 36; retirement of the Persian army to, after their defeat at Mykalê, v. 268; Alkibiadês's imprisonment at, and escape from, viii. 161, 162; forces of Cyrus the Younger collected at, ix. 15; march of Cyrus the Younger from, to Kunaxa, ix. 19 *seq.*; victory of Agesilaus near, ix. 370; surrender of, to Alexander, xii. 119.

Sarissa, xii. 77, 136 *seq.*
Sarmatians, iii. 327.
Sarpédón, i. 300.
Sataspés, iii. 385, 387 *n.*
Satrapies of Darius Hystaspês, iv. 317 *seq.*
Satraps under Darius Hystaspês, discontents of, iv. 305 *seq.*; of Alexander, xii. 321 *seq.*
Satyrus of Herakleia, xii. 628.
Satyrus I. of Bosporus, xi. 369 *n.* 2, xii. 651.
Satyrus the actor, xi. 377, 506.
Satyrus II. of Bosporus, xii. 654.
Saxo Grammaticus and Snorro Sturleson contrasted with Pherekydes and Hellanikus, i. 627.
Scales, Æginæan and Euboic, ii. 428 *seq.*, 436; Æginæan, Euboic and Attic, iii. 230.
Scandinavian mythical genealogies, i. 623 *n.* 2; and Teutonic epic, i. 640 *seq.*
Scardus, ii. 283.
Science, physical, commencement of, among the Greeks, i. 495.
Scientific views, opposition of, to religious, among the Greeks, i. 484–499 *seq.*
Scission between the superior men and the multitude among the Greeks, i. 506.
Sculpture at Athens, under Periklês, vi. 30.
Scurrility at festivals, iv. 108 *n.* 1.
Scylla, i. 1, 302.
Scythia, iii. 319, 320; Darius's invasion of, iv. 353 *seq.*
Scythians, iii. 317 *seq.*, xii. 643; invasion of Asia Minor and Upper Asia by, iii. 331 *seq.*; strong impression produced by, upon Herodotus's imagination, iv. 361; attack of Philip on, xi. 639; and Alexander, xii. 278, 288.
Secession of the mythical races of Greece, ii. 26.
Seisachtheia, or debtors' relief-law of Solon, iii. 135 *seq.*
Selênê, i. 8, 468 *n.*
Seleukus, alliance of, with Kassander, Lysimachus, and Ptolemy against Antigonus, xii. 496, 502, 517, 522; Kassander, Lysimachus, and Ptolemy, pacification of, with Antigonus, xii. 501; and the Pontic Hêrakleia, xii. 636, 637; death of, xii. 637.
Selinuntines, defeat of, by the Egestæans and Carthaginians, x. 557.
Selinus, iii. 491; and Egesta, vii. 196, x. 553, 557; application of, to Syracuse, x. 558; capture of, by Hannibal, x. 559 *seq.*; abandonment of, by the rest of Sicily, x. 564; Hermokrates at, x. 576.
Selli, ii. 358.
Selymbria, viii. 170, 180, xi. 630 *n.* 1.
Selymbris, iv. 36.
Semelê, i. 353.
Semi-historical interpretation of ancient mythes, i. 574.
Senate and Agora subordinate in legendary, paramount in historical Greece, ii. 104; Spartan, ii. 465, 482; of Areopagus, iii. 98; powers of, enlarged by Solon, iii. 164; of Four Hundred, Solon's, iii. 164; of Five Hundred, iv. 185; at Athens, expulsion of, by the Four Hundred, viii. 51.
Senators, addition to the oath of Athenian, viii. 409.
Sentiment, mingled ethical and mythical, in "Works and Days," i. 92 *seq.*
Sêpias Aktê, Xerxes's fleet at, v. 115 *seq.*
Servitude, temporary, of the gods, i. 78, 155 *n.* 4.
Sestos, capture of, B.C. 479, v. 271 *seq.*; escape of the Athenian squadron from, to Elæus, viii. 142; Derkyllidas at, ix. 445; capture of, by Kotys, x. 514; surrender of, to Athens, B.C. 358, x. 523 *n.*; conquest of, by Chares, xi. 361.
Seuthes, and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 211, 230 *seq.*
Seven chiefs against Thebes, the, i. 370.
Seven wise men of Greece, iv. 126 *seq.*
Sibyl, the Erythræan, i. 37.
Sibylline prophecies, i. 37, 457.
Sicilian Greeks, prosperity of, between B.C. 735 and 485, iii. 492 *seq.*; Greeks, peculiarity of their monetary and statical scale, iii. 494; comedy, iii. 499; Greeks, early governments of, v. 278; Greeks, and Phenicians, v. 280; cities, B.C. 431, vii. 175, 179; and Italian Dorians, aid expected from, by Sparta, vii. 177; cities, general peace between, B.C. 424, vii. 189; aid to Syracuse, B.C. 413, vii. 405.
Sicily, Phenicians and Greeks in, iii. 372; ante-Hellenic population of, iii. 468, 485, 500; and Italy, early languages and history of, iii. 474 *n.*; and Italy, date of earliest Grecian colony in, iii. 476; rapid multiplication of Grecian colonies in, after B.C. 735, iii. 482; the voyage from Greece to, iii. 483; spot where the Greeks first landed in, iii. 484; Megarian, iii. 488; subcolonies from, iii. 490; Sikel or Sikan caverns in, iii. 492 *n.*; mixed population of, iii. 494; difference between Greeks in, and those in Greece Proper, iii. 498; despots in, about B.C. 500, v. 279; Carthaginian invasion of, B.C. 480, v. 298; expulsion of despots from, B.C. 465, v. 317; after the expulsion of despots, B.C. 465, v. 317, 320 *seq.*, vii. 163; return of Duketius to, vii. 170; intellectual movement in, between B.C. 461–416, vii. 173; relations of, to Athens and Sparta, altered by the quarrel between Corinth and Korkyra, vii. 176; Dorians attack the Ionians in, about B.C. 427, vii. 179; Ionic cities in, solicit aid from Athens, against the Dorians, B.C. 427, vii. 180; Athenian expedition to, B.C. 427, vii. 181; Athenian expedition to, B.C. 425, vii. 182; Athenian expedition to, B.C. 422, vii. 194; Athenian expedition to, B.C. 415, vii. 197–225, 243–265, 294–376; Athenian expedition to, B.C. 413, vii. 377–393, 396–486; effect of the Athenian disaster in, upon all Greeks, vii. 500; interven-

tion of Carthage in, B.C. 410, x. 553 *seq.*; invasion of, by Hannibal, B.C. 409, x. 559 *seq.*; abandonment of Selinus by the Hellenic cities of, B.C. 409, x. 561; Hannibal's return from, B.C. 409, x. 573; return of Hermokrates to, x. 574; invasion of, by Hannibal and Imilkon, x. 583 *seq.*; southern, depressed condition of, B.C. 405, x. 635; expedition of Dionysius against the Carthaginians in, x. 673 *seq.*; frequency of pestilence among the Carthaginians in, xi. 1; Dionysius's conquests in the interior of, B.C. 391, xi. 5; condition of, B.C. 353–344, xi. 183; voyage of Timoleon to, xi. 202 *seq.*; invasion of, by the Carthaginians, B.C. 340, xi. 241; Timoleon in, xi. 241–276; expedition to, under Giskon, xi. 254; Agathokles in, xii. 594 *seq.*; ceases to be under Hellenic agency after Agathokles, xii. 611.

Sidon, iii. 360; conquest of, by Darius Nothus, xi. 606; surrender of, to Alexander, xii. 176.

Sidus, capture of, by the Lacedæmonians, ix. 466; recovery of, by Iphikrates, ix. 490.

Siege of Troy, i. 390–412.

Sigeium, Mitylenæans at, i. 457; and Peisistratus, iv. 159.

Sikans, iii. 468, 470 *n.* 2, 496.

Sikel prince, Dukètius, iii. 500.

Sikels, iii. 468; in Italy, iii. 470, 503; migration of, from Italy to Sicily, iii. 473 *n.*; in Sicily, iii. 496, x. 688, xi. 7, 8.

Sikinnus, v. 173, 190, 425 *n.* 2.

Sikyôn, origin of, i. 164 *seq.*; early condition of, iii. 5; despots at, iii. 43 *seq.*, 51; classes of people at, iii. 48; names of Dorian and non-Dorian tribes at, iii. 45, 50; Corinth, and Megara, analogy of, iii. 64; Athenian attacks upon, v. 450; Spartan and Argeian expedition against, vii. 132; desertion of, from Sparta to Thebes, x. 351; intestine dissensions at, B.C. 367–366, x. 368 *seq.*; Euphron at, x. 368 *seq.*, 373, 374.

Silanus the prophet, ix. 53, 181 *seq.*

Silphium, iv. 45.

Silver race, the, i. 89.

Simon, i. 411.

Simonidès of Keôs, epigram of, on the battle of Thermopylæ, v. 143; mediation of, between Hiero and Thero, v. 307.

Simonidès of Amorgus, poetry of, i. 489, iv. 110, 122.

Sinôpê and the Amazons, i. 291 *n.* 3; date of the foundation of, iii. 337 *n.* 2; Perikles's expedition to, vi. 14; and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 175 *seq.*, 197; long independence of, xii. 621; envoys from, with Darius, xii. 622.

Siphnus, iii. 223; attack of Samian exiles on, iv. 328.

Sirens, the, i. 1.

Siris, or Herakleia, iii. 515.

Sisygambis, xii. 167, 207, 223, 232.

Sisyphus, i. 163 *seq.*

Sitalkès, vi. 191, 286 *seq.*

Sithônia, iv. 31, 32.

Sittakè, the Ten Thousand Greeks at, ix. 86.

Skalds, Icelandic, songs of, ii. 202 *n.* 1, ii. 209 *n.*

Skedasus, x. 241.

Skêpsis, Derkyllidas at, ix. 295.

Skillus, Xenophon at, ix. 243 *seq.*

Skiônè, revolt of, from Athens to Brasidas, vi. 594 *seq.*; dispute about, after the One year's truce between Athens and Sparta, vi. 597; blockade of, by the Athenians, B.C. 423, vi. 603; capture of, by the Athenians, B.C. 421, vii. 31.

Skiritæ, vii. 109, 115, x. 318.

Skylax, iv. 319, 382, x. 311 *n.* 4.

Skyllêtium, iii. 514.

Skyros, conquest of, by Kimon, v. 412.

Skytalism at Argos, x. 271 *seq.*

Skythès of Zanklè, v. 285 *seq.*

Skythini, and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 151.

Slavery of debtors in Attica before Solon, iii. 129.

Slaves in legendary Greece, ii. 132 *seq.*

Smerdis, iv. 299 *seq.*

Sminthian Apollo, i. 68, 455.

Smyrna, iii. 245, 254.

Social War, xi. 310, 325.

Socratic philosophers, their unjust condemnation of rhapsodes, ii. 187.

Socratici viri, viii. 555 *n.*

Sogdian rock, capture of, by Alexander, xii. 289.

Sogdiana, Alexander in, xii. 273 *seq.*, 280.

Sôkratès, his treatment of the discrepancy between scientific and religious views, i. 499; treatment of, by the Athenians, i. 504 *seq.*; alleged impiety of, attacked by Aristophanês, i. 538 *n.*; and the sophists, v. 543, vii. 51 *n.*, viii. 521 *n.*, 551, 597 *n.*; at the battle of Delium, vi. 510; and Alkibiadês, vii. 47 *seq.*; and Kritias, vii. 48 *seq.*; at the Athenian assembly, on the generals at Arginusæ, viii. 271; and the Thirty, viii. 333, 352; and Parmenidês, viii. 471 *n.*; dislike of, to teaching for pay, viii. 482; life, character, philosophy, teaching, and death of, viii. 551–683.

Solemnities and games, i. 137.

Soli in Cyprus, iii. 201.

Sollium, Athenian capture of, vi. 183.

Soloeis, Cape, iii. 366 *n.* 3.

Solon and the Iliad, ii. 205 *n.* 1; civil condition of Attica before, iii. 67; life, character, laws, and constitution of, iii. 121–212.

Sophoklès, his Œdipus, i. 368; his treatment of mythes, i. 511 *seq.*, 519; Periklès, &c., Athenian armament under, against Samos, vi. 37 *seq.*; number of tragedies by, viii. 437 *n.*; Æschylus and Euripidês, viii. 441; and Herodotus, viii. 443 *n.* 1.

Sophoklès and Eurymedon, expeditions of, to

Sicily and Korkyra, vi. 424 *seq.*, 426 *seq.*, vii. 182, 186, 190.
Sosis, xi. 144.
Sosistratus, xii. 531, 532, 538, 547.
Sothiac period and Manetho, iii. 454 *seq.*
Sparta and Mykenæ, i. 226 *seq.*; occupation of, by the Dorians, ii. 11, 419, 439 *seq.*, 486; and the disunion of Greek towns, ii. 346; not strictly a city, ii. 348; inferior to Argos and neighbouring Dorians, B.C. 776, ii. 413, 420; first historical view of, ii. 442; not the perfect Dorian type, ii. 459; pair of kings at, ii. 469; classification of the population at, ii. 486 *seq.*; syssitia and public training at, ii. 513 *seq.*; partition of lands at, ascribed to Lykurgus, ii. 530–561; progressive increase of, ii. 566; and Lepreum, ii. 592; Argos, and Arcadia, relations of, ii. 596 *n.* 4; and Mantinea, ii. 598; and Arcadia, ii. 600 *seq.*; and Tegea, ii. 601 *seq.*; bones of Orestes taken to, ii. 602; acquisitions of, towards Argos, ii. 604 *seq.*; extensive possessions and power of by, B.C. 540, ii. 609 *seq.*; military institutions of, ii. 614 *seq.*; recognized superiority of, ii. 621, iv. 326, 430; peculiar government of, iii. 8; alleged intervention of, with the Nemean and Isthmian games, iv. 89 *n.* 2; exclusive character of her festivals, iv. 94; musical and poetical tendencies at, iv. 111 *seq.* 115 *n.*; choric training at, iv. 113 *seq.*; first appearance of, as head of Peloponnesian allies, iv. 226, 234 *seq.*; preparations at, for attacking Athens, after the failure of Kleomenês, iv. 233 *seq.*; and Crœsus, iv. 257; and Asiatic Greeks, iv. 268, ix. 284, 287; and Samian exiles, iv. 326; and Aristagoras, iv. 385 *seq.*; treatment of Darius's herald at, iv. 427; appeal of Athenians to, against the Medism of Ægina, iv. 429; war of, against Argos, B.C. 496–5, iv. 432 *seq.*; no heralds sent from Xerxes to, v. 78; Pan-Hellenic congress convened by, at the Isthmus of Corinth, v. 78 *seq.*; leaves Athens undefended against Mardonius, v. 207 *seq.*; headship of the allied Greeks transferred from, to Athens, v. 348 *seq.*; and Athens, first open separation between, v. 350, 353 *seq.*, 394; secret promise of, to the Thasians, to invade Attica, v. 423; restores the supremacy of Thebes in Bœotia, v. 426, 443; and the rest of Peloponnesus, between B.C. 477–457, v. 427; earthquake and revolt of Helots at, B.C. 464, v. 428 *seq.*; Athenian auxiliaries to, against the Helots, v. 429 *seq.*; Athenians renounce the alliance of, B.C. 464, v. 433; and Athens, five years' truce between, v. 453; and Delphi, B.C. 452–447, v. 468; and Athens, thirty years' truce between, v. 475; application of Samians to, vi. 41; imperial, compared with imperial Athens, vi. 54, ix. 262 *seq.*; and her subject-allies, vi. 57; and Athens, confederacies of, vi. 66; promise of, to the Potidæans, to invade Attica, vi. 96; application of the Lesbians to, vi. 103; assembly at, before the Peloponnesian war, vi. 106 *seq.*; relations of, with her allies, vi. 107; congress of allies at, B.C. 432, vi, 125 *seq.*; requisitions addressed to Athens by, B.C. 431, vi. 132 *seq.*, 142 *seq.*; efforts of, to raise a naval force on commencing the Peloponnesian war, vi. 169; and the Mitylenæans, vi. 306 *seq.*; despatches from Artaxerxes to, vi. 490 *seq.*; and Athens, one year's truce between, B.C. 423, vi. 588 *seq.*, 613, 618 *seq.*; and the Peace of Nikias, vii. 3, 13; and Argos, uncertain relations between, B.C. 421, vii. 4; and Athens, alliance between, B.C. 421, vii. 6; revolt of Elis from, vii. 34 *seq.*; congress at, B.C. 421, vii. 33; and Bœotia, alliance between, B.C. 420, vii. 36; and Argos, fifty years' peace between, vii. 35 *seq.*; embassy of Nikias to, vii. 66; and Athens, relations between, B.C. 419, vii. 95; and the battle of Mantinea, B.C. 418, vii. 120; and Argos, peace and alliance between, B.C. 418, vii. 125 *seq.*; submission of Mantinea to, vii. 129; and Athens, relations between, B.C. 416, vii. 140; and Sicily, relations of, altered by the quarrel between Corinth and Korkyra, vii. 176; aid expected from the Sicilian Dorians by, B.C. 431, vii. 177; embassy from Syracuse and Corinth to, B.C. 415, vii. 319 *seq.*; Alkibiadês at, vii. 320 *seq.*, viii. 2; and Athens, violation of the peace between, B.C. 414, vii. 392; resolution of, to fortify Dekeleia and send a force to Syracuse, B.C. 414, vii. 393; application from Chios to, vii. 502; embassy from Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus to, vii. 503; embassy from the Four Hundred to, viii. 86, 113; proposals of peace from, to Athens, B.C. 410, viii. 165 *seq.*; alleged proposals of peace from, to Athens, after the battle of Arginusæ, viii. 286; first proposals of Athens to, after the battle of Ægospotami, viii. 308; embassies of Theramenês to, viii. 309, 311; assembly of the Peloponnesian confederacy at, B.C. 404, viii. 311; terms of peace granted to Athens by, B.C. 404, viii. 312; triumphant return of Lysander to, viii. 324; and her allies, after the capture of Athens by Lysander, viii. 354; oppressive dominion of, after the capture of Athens by Lysander, viii. 356; opposition to Lysander at, viii. 358; pacification by, between the Ten at Athens and the exiles at Peiræus, viii. 380; empire of, contrasted with her promises of liberty, ix. 262 *seq.*; change in the language and plans of, towards the close of the Peloponnesian war, ix. 268; and the Thirty at Athens, ix. 273; opportunity lost by, for organising a stable confederacy throughout Greece, ix. 278 *seq.*; alienation of the allies of, after the battle of Ægospotami, ix. 307 *seq.*; and Elis, war

between, ix. 310 *seq.*; refuses to restore the Olympic presidency to the Pisatans, ix. 317; expels the Messenians from Peloponnesus, ix. 317; introduction of gold and silver to, by Lysander, ix. 319 *seq.*; in B.C. 432 and after B.C. 404, contrast between, ix. 322; position of kings at, ix. 330 *seq.*; conspiracy of Kinadon at, ix. 343 *seq.*; Persian preparations for maritime war against, B.C. 397, ix. 354, 374; revolt of Rhodes from, ix. 375; relations of, with her neighbours and allies, after the accession of Agesilaus, ix. 395; and Hêrakleia Trachynia, ix. 396, 420; and Timokrates, ix. 398 *seq.*; and Thebes, war between, B.C. 395, ix. 402 *seq.*; alliance of Thebes, Athens, Corinth, and Argos against, ix. 419; proceedings of, against Thebes, Athens, Corinth, and Argos, ix. 421, 424 *seq.*; consequences of the battles of Corinth, Knidus, and Korôneia to, ix. 441 *seq.*; hostility of, to partial land confederacies in Greece, ix. 500; congress at, on the peace of Antalkidas, ix. 535; and the peace of Antalkidas, x. 2 *seq.*, 11 *seq.*, 37; applications of, for Persian aid, x. 7 *seq.*; and Persia after the battle of Ægospotami, x. 10; and Grecian autonomy, x. 14 *seq.*, 38; miso-Theban proceedings of, after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 37 *seq.*; restores Platæa, x. 40 *seq.*; oppressive conduct of, towards Mantinea, B.C. 386, x. 47 *seq.*; mischievous influence of, after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 53 *seq.*; naval competition of Athens with, after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 56 *seq.*; and the Olynthian confederacy, x. 71 *seq.*, 78, 88 *seq.*; and the surprise of Thebes by Phœbidas, x. 83 *seq.*; and Phlius, x. 95; ascendency and unpopularity of, B.C. 379, x. 99 *seq.*; Xenophon on the conduct of, between B.C. 387–379, x. 106; effect of the revolution at Thebes, B.C. 379, on, x. 127; trial of Sphodrias at, x. 136 *seq.*; war declared by Athens against, B.C. 378, x. 138; separate peace of Athens with, B.C. 374, x. 186, 192; and Polydamas, x. 186 *seq.*; decline of the power of, between B.C. 382–374, x. 190; discouragement of, by her defeat at Korkyra and by earthquakes, B.C. 372, x. 212; disposition of Athens to peace with, B.C. 372, x. 214, 222; general peace settled at, B.C. 371, x. 222 *seq.*, 236, 269; effect of the news of the defeat at Leuktra on, x. 253; and Athens, difference between in passive endurance and active energy, x. 255; reinforcements from, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 256; treatment of defeated citizens on their return from Leuktra, x. 261 *seq.*; and Thebes, alleged arbitration of the Achæans between, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 271 *n.*; position of, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 273; and the Amphiktyonic assembly, x. 275 *seq.*, xi. 341; feeling against Agesilaus at, B.C. 371, x. 282; hostile approaches of Epaminondas to, x. 298 *seq.*, 453 *seq.*; abstraction of Western Laconia from, x. 310 *seq.*; application of, to Athens for aid against Thebes, B.C. 369, x. 320 *seq.*; and Athens, alliance between, B.C. 369, x. 346; reinforcement from Syracuse in aid of, x. 350; peace of her allies with Thebes, x. 397 *seq.*; alliance of Elis and Achæia with, B.C. 365, x. 429; and Dionysius, x. 634, 705, xi. 30; degradation of, B.C. 360–359, xi. 279 *seq.*; countenance of the Phokians by, B.C. 353, xi. 367; plans of, against Megalopolis and Messênê, B.C. 353, xi. 368, 405; decline in military readiness among the Peloponnesian allies of, after the Peloponnesian war, xi. 392; ineffectual campaign of, against Megalopolis, xi. 418 *seq.*; envoys from, to Philip, xi. 560, 566; envoys from, with Darius, xii. 256; anti-Macedonian policy of, after Alexander's death, xii. 378 *seq.*

Spartan kings, ii. 15, 104, 473 *seq.*; senate, assembly, and ephors, ii. 465 *seq.*; popular assembly, ii. 480; constitution, ii. 483 *seq.*; government, secrecy of, ii. 508; discipline, ii. 513 *seq.*; women, ii. 516 *seq.*; law and practice of succession, erroneous suppositions about, ii. 552 *seq.*; arbitration of the dispute between Athens and Megara about Salamis, iii. 126; expeditions against Hippias, iv. 163; empire, commencement of, ix. 250, 254 *seq.*, 262 *seq.*; empire, Theopompus on, ix. 270 *n.*; allies at the battle of Leuktra, x. 247.

Spartans, and Pheidôn, ii. 428; and Messenians, early proceedings of, ii. 445; local distinctions among, ii. 488; the class of, ii. 488 *seq.*; and Helots, ii. 506 *seq.*; marriage among, ii. 519; their ignorance of letters, ii. 526 *n.* 2; musical susceptibilities of, ii. 582; and the second Messenian war, ii. 585, 589; careful training of, when other states had none, ii. 612; and the battle of Marathon, iv. 462, 485; unwillingness of, to postpone or neglect festivals, v. 107; at Platæa, v. 220, 232 *seq.*; and the continental Ionians after the battle of Mykalê, v. 269; and the fortification of Athens, v. 331 *seq.*; favourable answer of the oracle at Delphi to, on war with Athens, B.C. 432, vi. 125; final answer of the Athenians to, before the Peloponnesian war, vi. 150; their desire for peace, to regain the captives from Sphakteria, vi. 582 *seq.*; and Thebans, at the battle of Korôneia, ix. 437; project of, for the rescue of the Asiatic Greeks, x. 59; miso-Theban impulse of, B.C. 371, x. 237; confidence and defeat of, at Leuktra, x. 243 *seq.*; retirement of, from Bœotia after the battle of Leuktra, x. 259; refusal of, to acknowledge the independence of Messênê, x. 398, 481; and Dion, xi. 85.

Sparti, i. 352, 353.

Spartokidæ, xii. 648 *seq.*
Speaking, public, its early origin and intellectual effects, ii. 105 *seq.*
Sperthiés and Bulis, vi. 247 *n.*
Speusippus, indictment of, by Leogoras, vii. 281 *n.* 2.
Sphakteria, locality of, vi. 426; occupation of, by the Lacedæmonians, vi. 432, 463; blockade of Lacedæmonians in, vi. 438, 451 *seq.*; Lacedæmonian embassy to Athens for the release of the prisoners in, vi. 440 *seq.*; Demosthenês's application for reinforcements to attack, vi. 453 *seq.*; condition of, on the attack by Demosthenês and Kleon, vi. 462; victory of Demosthenês and Kleon over Lacedæmonians in, vi. 463 *seq.*; surrender of Lacedæmonians in, vi. 469 *seq.*; arrival of prisoners from, at Athens, vi. 478; restoration of prisoners taken at, vii. 8 *seq.*; disfranchisement of restored prisoners from, vii. 30.
Sphendaleis, Attic deme of, v. 215 *n.* 1.
Sphinx, the, i. 10, 362.
Sphodrias, attempt of, to surprise Peiræus, x. 133 *seq.*
Spitamenes, xii. 280, 288, 289.
Spithridates and the Lacedæmonians, ix. 361, 381 *seq.*
Stable, the Augean, i. 189.
Stageira, iv. 33.
Standard of historical evidence raised with regard to England, but not with regard to Greece, i. 648.
Stasippus, x. 285.
Statira, xii. 167, 209, 324.
Statues, Greek, identified with the beings they represented, i. 616.
Stenyklêrus, Dorians of, ii. 439 *seq.*
Steropês, i. 6.
Stesichorus, the lyric poet, and Helen, i. 414 *seq.*; dialect of, iv. 117 *seq.*
Stesiklês, x. 195, 199 *n.*
Sthenelaïdas, the ephor, vi. 122 *seq.*
Story of striking off the overtopping ears of corn, iii. 33 *n.*
Strabo on the Amazons, i. 294; his version of the Argonautic expedition, i. 347; on Old and New Ilium, i. 445 *seq.*; his transformation of mythes to history, i. 554.
Strangers, supplication of, ii. 109 *n*; reception of, in legendary Greece, ii. 116.
Stratêgi, Kleisthenean, iv. 182; enlarged functions of Athenian, after the Persian war, v. 375.
Stratolas, x. 438, 439.
Stratus, attack of Peloponnesians, Ambrakiots and Epirots upon, B.C. 429, vi. 263.
Strelitzes, suppression of the revolt of, by Peter the Great, iv. 313 *n.*
Strombichidês, pursuit of Chalkideus and Alkibiadês by, vii. 511; expedition of, to Chios, vii. 515, 537, 540; removal of, from Chios to the Hellespont, viii. 127; arrival of, at Samos, from the Hellespont, viii. 129; and other Athenian democrats, imprisonment of, viii. 320; trial and execution of, viii. 326 *seq.*
Strophê, introduction of, iv. 119.
Struthas, victory of, over Thimbron, ix. 502.
Strymôn, Greek settlements east of, in Thrace, iv. 33; Xerxes's bridges across the, v. 35.
Styx, i. 10, 11.
Styx, rocks near, ii. 405 *n.*
Subterranean course of rivers in Greece, ii. 292.
Succession, Solon's laws of, iii. 187.
Suli, iii. 562.
Suppliants, reception of, in legendary Greece, ii. 116.
Supplication of strangers, ii. 109 *n.*
Susa, sum found by Alexander the Great at, iv. 317 *n.* 2; Pharnabazus conveys Greek escorts towards, viii. 183; Alexander at, xii. 229, 320; Alexander's march from, to Persepolis, xii. 231 *seq.*
Susia, xii. 257.
Susian Gates, Alexander at, xii. 232.
Syagrus, reply of, to Gelôn, i. 228.
Sybaris, foundation, territory and colonies of, iii. 504 *seq.*; fall of, iii. 525, 534, iv. 556 *seq.*; maximum power of, iii. 528 *seq.*; and Krotôn, war between, iv. 554.
Sybarites, character of, iii. 528 *seq.*; defeat of, by the Krotoniates, iv. 556; descendants of, at Thurii, vi. 19.
"*Sybaritic tales*," iii. 528.
Syennesis of Kilikia, and Cyrus the Younger, ix. 27.
Sylosôn, iv. 334 *seq.*
Symmories at Athens, x. 158 *seq.*; speech of Demosthenês on the, xi. 398 *seq.*
Symplégades, the, i. 322.
Syntagma, Macedonian, xii. 81.
Syracusan assembly, on the approaching Athenian expedition, B.C. 415, vii. 249 *seq.*; ships, improvements in, to suit the narrow harbour, vii. 408; squadron under Hermokrates against Athens in the Ægean, x. 530 *seq.*; generals at Agrigentum, complaints against, x. 591, 597; generals at Agrigentum, speech of Dionysius against, x. 600 *seq.*; horsemen, mutiny of, against Dionysius, x. 626 *seq.*; soldiers, mutiny of, against Dionysius, x. 641 *seq.*
Syracusans, confidence and proceedings of, after the capture of Plemmyrium, B.C. 413, vii. 402 *seq.*; and Athenians, conflicts between, in the Great Harbour, vii. 404, 409 *seq.*, 434 *seq.*, 445 *seq.*; defeat of the Athenian night attack upon Epipolæ by, vii. 421 *seq.*; their blockade of the Athenians in the harbour, vii. 439; captured by Thrasyllus, viii. 175; delay of, in aiding Selinus, B.C. 409, x. 558, 564; improvement in Dionysius's behaviour towards, B.C. 399, x. 658; victory of, over the Carthaginians in the Great Harbour, x. 698; negotiations of Dionysius the Younger with Dion and the, xi. 134; defeat of Dionysius the Younger, by Dion

and the, xi. 135 *seq.*; application from, to Dion at Leontini, xi. 151; gratitude of, to Dion, xi. 157; opposition of, to Dion as dictator, xi. 170 *seq.*; application of, to Hiketas and Corinth, B.C. 344, xi. 189 *seq.*; and Timoleon, application of, to Corinth, xi. 236.

Syracuse, foundation of, iii. 486; petalism or ostracism at, iv. 218; inferior to Agrigentum and Gela, before B.C. 500, v. 276; in B.C. 500, v. 278; increased population and power of, under Gelo, v. 289 *seq.*; prisoners awarded to, after the battle of Himera, v. 304; topography of, B.C. 465, v. 315 *n.*; fall of the Gelonian dynasty at, v. 316 *seq.*; Gelonian citizens of, v. 317 *seq.*; reaction against despotism at, after the fall of the Gelonian dynasty, v. 322; political dissensions and failure of ostracism at, vii. 165; foreign exploits of, B.C. 452, vii. 167; Duketius at, vii. 169; and Agrigentum, hostilities between, B.C. 446, vii. 171; conquests and ambitious schemes of, B.C. 410, vii. 172; incredulity and contempt at, as to the Athenian armament for Sicily, B.C. 415, vii. 248; quiescence of the democracy at, vii. 250 *n.*; preparations at, on the approach of the Athenian armament, B.C. 415, vii. 259; empty display of the Athenian armament at, B.C. 415, vii. 264; increased confidence at, through Nikias's inaction, B.C. 415, vii. 296; landing of Nikias and his forces in the Great Harbour of, B.C. 415, vii. 298; defensive measures of, after the battle near the Olympieion, vii. 310; embassy from, to Corinth and Sparta, B.C. 415, vii. 319; local condition and fortifications of, in the spring of B.C. 414, vii. 333; localities outside the walls of, vii. 334; possibilities of the siege of, B.C. 415 and 414, vii. 335; siege of, B.C. 414, vii. 340 *seq.*; battle near, B.C. 414, vii. 348 *seq.*; entrance of the Athenian fleet into the Great Harbour at, B.C. 414, vii. 350; approach of Gylippus to, vii. 357 *seq.*; arrival of Gylippus and Gongylus at, vii. 363; expedition to, under Demosthenês, B.C. 413, vii. 396; Athenian victory in the harbour of, B.C. 413, vii. 399; defeat of a Sicilian reinforcement to, B.C. 413, vii. 405; disadvantages of the Athenian fleet in the harbour of, vii. 407; arrival of Demosthenês at, vii. 413, 415; philo-Athenians at, during the siege, vii. 428 *n.*; increase of force and confidence in, after the night attack upon Epipolæ, vii. 431; postponement of the Athenians' retreat from, by an eclipse of the moon, vii. 432; number and variety of forces engaged at, vii. 438; postponement of the Athenians' retreat from, by Hermokratês, vii. 455; retreat of the Athenians from, vii. 457 *seq.*; number and treatment of Athenian prisoners at, vii. 474 *seq.*; topography of, and the operations during the Athenian siege, vii. 555 *seq.*; sally of Athens during the year after the disaster at, viii. 1; reinforcement from, in aid of Sparta, B.C. 368, x. 353; after the destruction of the Athenian armament, x. 528, 536 *seq.*; and the quarrel between Selinus and Egesta, B.C. 410, x. 556 *seq.*; embassy from, to Hannibal, at Selinus, x. 565; aid from, to Himera, against Hannibal, x. 566, 568; attempts of Hermokrates to re-enter, x. 575 *seq.*; first appearance of Dionysius at, x. 581; discord at, B.C. 407, x. 582; reinforcement from, to Agrigentum, x. 590; movement of the Hermokratean party at, to raise Dionysius to power, x. 598; Dionysius one of the generals at, x. 602 *seq.*; return of the Hermokratean exiles to, x. 606; return of Dionysius from Gela to, B.C. 405, x. 608; establishment of Dionysius as despot at, x. 615 *seq.*, 630; re-distribution of property at, by Dionysius, x. 637 *seq.*; locality of, x. 653; additional fortifications at, by Dionysius, x. 655 *seq.*; plunder of Carthaginians at, by permission of Dionysius, x. 671; provisions of Dionysius for the defence of, against the Carthaginians, B.C. 396, x. 688; retreat of Dionysius from, to Katana, B.C. 395, x. 693; siege of, by Imilkon, x. 695 *seq.*; Carthaginians before, x. 695 *seq.*, 706 *seq.*; exultation at, over the burning of the Carthaginian fleet at Daskon, x. 710; new constructions and improvements by Dionysius at, xi. 54; feeling at, towards Dionysius the Younger and Dion, B.C. 357, xi. 119; Dion's march from Herakleia to, xi. 125; Timokrates, governor of, xi. 127 *seq.*; Dion's entries into, B.C. 357 and B.C. 356, xi. 128 *seq.*, 154; flight of Dionysius the Younger from, to Lokri, xi. 145; rescue of, by Dion, xi. 151 *seq.*; condition of, B.C. 353–344, xi. 182 *seq.*; return of Dionysius the Younger to, xi. 186; first arrival of Timoleon at, xi. 211; return of Timoleon from Adranum to, xi. 223; flight of Magon from, xi. 224 *seq.*; Timoleon's temptations and conduct on becoming master of, xi. 231 *seq.*; Timoleon's recall of exiles to, xi. 235; desolate condition of, on coming into the hands of Timoleon, xi. 235, 237; efforts of Corinth to re-constitute, xi. 236, 238; influx of colonists to, on the invitation of Corinth and Timoleon, xi. 239; Timoleon marches from, against the Carthaginians, xi. 243 *seq.*; Timoleon lays down his power at, xi. 261; great influence of Timoleon at, after his resignation, xi. 262, 273; residence of Timoleon at, xi. 268; Timoleon in the public assembly of, xi. 269 *seq.*; the constitution established by Timoleon at, exchanged for a democracy, xii. 531; expedition from, to Krotôn, about B.C. 320, xii. 536; revolutions at, about B.C. 320, xii. 538, 540; massacre at, by Agathokles in collusion with Hamilkar, xii.

541 *seq.*; Agathokles constituted despot of, xii. 543; Hamilkar's unsuccessful attempt to take, xii. 570 *seq.*; barbarities of Agathokles at, after his African expedition, xii. 603.
Syrians not distinguished from Assyrians in Greek authors, iii. 391 *n.*
Syrphax, xii. 121.
Syssitia, or public mess at Sparta, ii. 513.

Tachos, x. 497 *seq.*
Tagus, Thessalian, ii. 377.
Talos, i. 328.
Tamos, x. 17.
Tamynæ, Phokion's victory at, xi. 476; Demosthenês reproached for his absence from the battle of, xi. 480.
Tanagra, battle of, v. 445; reconciliation of leaders and parties at Athens, after the battle of, v. 447.
Tantalus, i. 215.
Taochi and the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 146 *seq.*
Taphians in Homer's time, ii. 138.
Taranto, fishery at, iii. 522 *n.*
Tarentines and Rhegians, expedition of, against the Iapygians, v. 323; and Messapians, xii. 532.
Tarentum, foundation of cities in the Gulf of, i. 308; Greek settlements on the Gulf of, iii. 514; foundation and position of, iii. 518 *seq.*
Tarsus, origin of, i. 116 *n.*, iii. 373; Cyrus the Younger at, ix. 28 *seq.*; Alexander at, xii. 152.
Tartarus, i. 5, 11, 12.
Tartessus, iii. 369; not visited by Greeks before B.C. 630, iii. 374; Kôlæus's voyage to, iii. 375.
Tauri in the Crimea, iii. 330.
Tauromenium, iii. 484; commencement of, x. 688; repulse of Dionysius at, xi. 6; capture of, by Dionysius, xi. 11; Timoleon at, xi. 207.
Taurus, xii. 217 *n.* 2.
Taurus, Mount, Alexander at, xii. 150.
Taxiarch, ii. 620.
Taxila, Alexander at, xii. 306.
Tearless Battle, the, x. 362 *seq.*
Tegea and Mantinea, ii. 596 *seq.*, vi. 617, vii. 19; and Sparta, ii. 601 *seq.*; bones of Orestês taken from, ii. 602; refusal of, to join Argos, B.C. 421, vii. 27; plans of the Argeian allies against, B.C. 418, vii. 103; march of Agis to the relief of, B.C. 418, vii. 104; revolution at, B.C. 370, x. 285; seizure of Arcadians at, by the Theban harmost, x. 445 *seq.*; Epaminondas at, B.C. 362, x. 452, 453, 457, 460 *seq.*; march of Epaminondas from, B.C. 362, x. 465 *seq.*
Tegyra, victory of Pelopidas at, x. 182.
Teian inscriptions, iii. 251 *n.*
Telamôn, i. 253 *seq.*
Telegonus, i. 426.
Telekus, conquests of, ii. 564; death of, ii. 572.
Telcontes, iii. 69.
Telephus, i. 243, 397.
Teleutias and Agesilaus, capture of the Long Walls at Corinth, and of Lechæum by, ix. 471 *seq.*; expedition of, to Rhodes, ix. 505, 511; at Ægina, ix. 517, 521; attack of, on the Peiræus, ix. 522 *seq.*; at Olynthus, x. 88 *seq.*
Telinês, iv. 141 *n.*, v. 281 *seq.*
Têlys, of Sybaris, iv. 554 *seq.*
Temenion and Solygeius, ii. 415.
Têmenus, Kresphontês, and Aristodêmus, ii. 2 *seq.*; and Kresphontês, family of, lowest in the series of subjects for heroic drama, ii. 14.
Têmnos, situation of, iii. 258 *n.* 3.
Tempê, remarks of Herodotus on the legend of, i. 537; Delphian procession to, ii. 369 *n.* 2; Grecian army sent to defend, against Xerxes, v. 92; abandonment of the defence of, against Xerxes, v. 93 *seq.*
Temple of Eleusis built by order of Dêmêtêr, i. 53.
Tenedos, continental settlements of, iii. 264; recovery of, by Macedonian admirals, xii. 192.
Ten, appointment of the, at Athens, viii. 371; measures of the, at Athens, viii. 372; peace between the, at Athens, and Thrasybulus, viii. 379 *seq.*; treatment of the, at Athens, B.C. 403, viii. 401.
Ten generals appointed to succeed Alkibiadês, viii. 216.
Tennes, the Sidonian prince, xi. 606.
Ten Thousand Greeks, position and circumstances of, ix. 15; commencement of their retreat, ix. 75; Persian heralds to, on commencing their retreat, ix. 77; negotiations and convention of Tissaphernes with, ix. 79 *seq.*; quarrel of, with Ariæus, ix. 83; retreating march of, under Tissaphernes, ix. 84 *seq.*; at the Tigris, ix. 86 *seq.*; at the Greater Zab, ix. 92; summoned by Ariæus to surrender, ix. 102; distress of, after the seizure of the generals, ix. 103; new generals appointed by, ix. 108; great ascendency of Xenophon over, ix. 113 *seq.*; crossing of the Great Zab by, ix. 119; harassing attacks of the Persian cavalry on, ix. 119 *seq.*; retreat of, along the Tigris, ix. 121 *seq.*; and the Karduchians, ix. 129 *seq.*; at the Kentritês, ix. 135 *seq.*; in Armenia, ix. 139 *seq.*; and the Chalybes, ix. 146 *seq.*; and the Taochi, ix. 146 *seq.*; and the Skythini, ix. 151; first sight of the Euxine by, ix. 152; and the Makrônes, ix. 153; and the Kolchians, ix. 154, 172; at Trapezus, ix. 155, 169 *seq.*; geography of the retreat of, ix. 157 *seq.*; feelings of the Greeks on the Euxine towards, ix. 166 *seq.*; leave Trapezus, ix. 172; at Kerasus, ix. 172; march of, to Kotyôra, ix. 174; at Kotyôra, ix. 175 *seq.*;

and the Paphlagonians, ix. 196; sail to Sinopê, ix. 197; at Herakleia, ix. 199; at Kalpê, ix. 201; and Kleander, ix. 204 *seq.*, 227; and Anaxibius, ix. 210 *seq.*, 226; and Seuthes, ix. 211, 230 *seq.*; after leaving Byzantium, ix. 221 *seq.*; and Aristarchus, ix. 227 *seq.*; under the Lacedæmonians, ix. 231, 241, 288, 300; in Mysia, ix. 237 *seq.*; Xenophon's farewell of, ix. 240; effects of their retreat on the Greek mind, ix. 247 *seq.*

Ten Thousand, the Pan-Arcadian, x. 317.

Teôs, foundation of, iii. 250; inscriptions of, iii. 251 *n.*; emigration from, on the conquest of Harpagus, iv. 273; loss of, to Athens, B.C. 412, vii. 516; capture of, by the Lacedæmonians, viii. 210.

Tereus, i. 269.

Terpander, ii. 190; musical improvements of, iv. 102.

Téthys, i. 6, 7.

Teukrians, the, i. 451, 265 *seq.*; and Mysians, ethnical affinities and migrations of, iii. 282 *seq.*

Teukrus, i. 259.

Teukrus, the metic, vii. 267, 269, 279 *n.* 2.

Teuthrania mistaken by the Greeks for Troy, i. 396.

Teutonic and Scandinavian epic, its analogy with the Grecian, i. 640 *seq.*; points of distinction between the Grecian and, i. 643.

Thais and the burning of the palace of Persepolis, xii. 239 *n.* 3.

Thalês, Xenophanês, and Pythagoras, i. 495 *seq.*; predictions ascribed to, ii. 156; alleged prediction of an eclipse of the sun by, iii. 314 *n.*; suggestion of, respecting the twelve Ionic cities in Asia, iii. 350; philosophy and celebrity of, iv. 513 *seq.*

Thalêtas, iv. 111, 115.

Thamyris, analogy between the story of, and that of Marsyas, iii. 290.

Thanatos, i. 9.

Thapsakus, Cyrus the Younger and his forces at, ix. 39 *seq.*; Alexander crosses the Euphrates at, xii. 204.

Thasos, island of, iv. 34; attempted revolt of, from the Persians, iv. 424; contribution levied by Xerxes on, v. 58; revolt of, from the confederacy of Delos, v. 419; blockade and conquest of, B.C. 464–463, v. 422; application of, to Sparta, for aid against Athens, v. 423; expulsion of the Lacedæmonians from, viii. 172; reduction of, by Thrasyllus, viii. 195; slaughter at, by Lysander, viii. 303.

Thaumas, i. 9, 10.

Theagenês of Rhegium, the first to allegorise mythical narratives, i. 562.

Theagenês, despot of Megara, iii. 59.

Theagenês of Thasos, statue of, v. 22 *n.* 3.

Theatre, Athenian, accessibility of, to the poorest citizens, viii. 438.

Thebaïd of Antimachus, i. 365.

Thêbaïs, the Cyclic, i. 364; ascribed to Homer, ii. 173.

Theban contingent of Leonidas, doubts about, v. 126, 130; leaders put to death after the battle of Platæa, v. 253; prisoners in the night-surprise at Platæa, slaughter of, vi. 160 *seq.*; military column, depth of, vi. 526, 531; band of Three Hundred, vi. 527; exiles at Athens, x. 82, 109 *seq.*

Thebans and Æginetans, i. 252; against the seven chiefs, i. 372; application of, to Ægina, for assistance against Athens, iv. 230; and Xerxes's invasion, v. 104; defeated by the Athenians at Platæa, v. 243; night-surprise of Platæa by, B.C. 431, vi. 153 *seq.*; capture of, in the night-surprise of Platæa, vi. 156 *seq.*; captured in the night-surprise of Platæa, slaughter of, vi. 160 *seq.*; opposition of, to peace with Athens, B.C. 404, viii. 341 *n.*; humiliation of Agesilaus by, ix. 358; application of, to Athens for aid against Sparta, B.C. 395, ix. 404 *seq.*; at the battle of Corinth, ix. 426 *n.*; and Spartans at the battle of Koronêia, ix. 137; and the peace of Antalkidas, ix. 535; expulsion of the Lacedæmonians from Bœotia by, B.C. 374, x. 183; invasion of Phokis by, B.C. 374, x. 184; discouragement and victory of, at Leuktra, x. 240 *seq.*; and allies, invasion of Laconia by, B.C. 370, x. 294 *seq.*; displeasure of, with Epaminondas, B.C. 367, x. 367; expeditions of, to Thessaly, to rescue Pelopidas, x. 388, 415 *seq.*; destruction of Orchomenus by, x. 426; under Pammenes, expedition of, to Megalopolis, x. 494; extinction of free cities in Bœotia by, xi. 285; exertions of, to raise a confederacy against the Phokians, B.C. 356, xi. 353; Lokrians, and Thessalians, war of, against the Phokians, B.C. 355, xi. 356; assistance under Pammenes sent by, to Artabazus, xi. 361, 418; assistance of, to Megalopolis against Sparta, B.C. 352–351, xi. 418 *seq.*; obtain money from the Persian king, B.C. 350–349, xi. 421; invoke the aid of Philip to put down the Phokians, xi. 520; Philip declares his sympathy with, B.C. 346, xi. 582; invited by Philip to assist in an attack upon Attica, B.C. 339, xi. 668 *seq.*; and Athenians, war of, against Philip in Phokis, xi. 681, 683 *seq.*; revolt of, against Alexander, xii. 39 *seq.*

Thêbê, xi. 288 *seq.*

Thebes and Orchomenos, i. 184; legends of, i. 349 *seq.*; how founded by Kadmus, i. 352; five principal families at, i. 353; foundation of, by Amphiôn, i. 359; poems on the sieges of, i. 365; sieges of, i. 366 *seq.*; the seven chiefs against, i. 370 *seq.*; repulse of the seven chiefs against, i. 372 *seq.*; the seven chiefs against, death of all but Adrastus, i. 373; the seven chiefs against, burial of the fallen, i. 376; second siege of, i. 378, 379; early legislation of, ii. 398; and Platæa, disputes between, iv.

223; summoned to give up its leaders after the battle of Platæa, v. 252; discredit of, for its *Medism*, v. 425; supremacy of, in Bœotia restored by Sparta, v. 426, 413; mastery of Athens over, B.C. 456, v. 449; reinforcements from, in support of the night-surprise at Platæa, vi. 159 *seq.*; hard treatment of Thespiæ by, B.C. 423, vi. 618; altered feeling of, after the capture of Athens by Lysander, viii. 354, 361, 376; and Sparta, war between, B.C. 395, ix. 402 *seq.*; revolt of Orchomenus from, to Sparta, ix. 408; alliance of, with Athens, Corinth, and Argos, against Sparta, ix. 419; increased importance of, B.C. 395, ix. 419; alarm at, and proposals of peace from, on the Lacedæmonian capture of the Long Walls at Corinth, ix. 473; envoys from, to Agesilaus, ix. 481, 489; and the peace of Antalkidas, x. 56; proceedings of Sparta against, after the peace of Antalkidas, x. 37 *seq.*; seizure of the Kadmeia at, by Phœbidas, x. 79 *seq.*; government of, B.C. 382, x. 80 *n.* 1; under Leontiades and other philo-Laconian oligarchs, x. 108 *seq.*; conspiracy against the philo-Laconian oligarchy at, x. 111 *seq.*; alliance of, with Athens, B.C. 378, x. 139; state of, after the revolution of, B.C. 379, x. 161; the Sacred Band at, x. 162; expeditions of Agesilaus against, B.C. 378 and 377, x. 171 *seq.*; displeasure of Athens against, B.C. 474, x. 181, 214; dealings of, with Platæa and Thespiæ, B.C. 372, x. 215 *seq.*; exclusion of, from the peace of B.C. 371, x. 226 *seq.*; increased power of, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 263; and Sparta, alleged arbitration of the Achæans between, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 271 *n.*; influence of, in Thessaly, B.C. 369, x. 340; alienation of the Arcadians from, B.C. 368, x. 354 *seq.*; assassination of Euphron at, x. 374 *seq.*; application of, to Persia, B.C. 367, x. 379 *seq.*; Persian rescript in favour of, x. 381 *seq.*; protest of the Arcadians against the headship of, x. 385; peace of Corinth, Epidaurus and Phlius with, B.C. 366, x. 397 *seq.*; opposition of the Mantineans and other Arcadians to, B.C. 362, x. 448; power of, B.C. 360–359, xi. 283 *seq.*; Philip at, xi. 293 *seq.*; Eubœa rescued from, by Athens, B.C. 358, xi. 306 *seq.*; accusation of, against Sparta before the Amphiktyonic assembly, xi. 341; accusation of, against Phokis before the Amphiktyonic assembly, xi. 342; the Phokians countenanced by Athens and Sparta as rivals of, xi. 367; envoys to Philip from, B.C. 346, xi. 560, 565; and Athens, unfriendly relations between, B.C. 339, xi. 669; mission of Demosthenês to, B.C. 339, xi. 673 *seq.*; and Athens, alliance of, against Philip, B.C. 339, xi. 677; severity of Philip towards, after the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 697; march of Alexander from Thrace to, xii. 48; capture and destruction of, by Alexander, xii. 50 *seq.*; restored by Kassander, xii. 496.

Thebes in Egypt, iii. 418.

Theft, laws of, at Athens, iii. 192.

Theia, i. 6, 8.

Themis, i. 6, 13

Themistoklês, character of, iv. 455 *seq.*; and Aristeidês, rivalry between, v. 69, 371; change of Athens from a land-power to a sea-power proposed by, v. 70; long-sighted views of, in creating a navy at Athens, v. 72, 398 *n.* 2; and the Laurian mines, v. 75; his explanation of the answer of the Delphian oracle on Xerxes's invasion, v. 84; prevails upon the Greeks to stay and fight at Artemisium, v. 133 *seq.*; inscribed invitations of, to the Ionians under Xerxes, v. 140; activity and resource of, on Xerxes's approach, v. 151; opposes the removal of the Greek fleet from Salamis to the isthmus of Corinth, v. 167 *seq.*; and Eurybiadês at Salamis, v. 168 *n*; and Adeimantus of Corinth, at Salamis, v. 168, 170; his message to Xerxes before the battle of Salamis, v. 173; his message to Xerxes after the battle of Salamis, v. 190; levies fines on the Cyclades, v. 192; honours rendered to, after the battle of Salamis, v. 198; alleged proposal of, to burn all the Grecian ships except the Athenian, v. 274 *n.* 2; stratagem of, respecting the fortification of Athens, v. 331 *seq.*; plans of, for the naval aggrandisement of Athens, v. 337 *seq.*; persuades the Athenians to build twenty new triremes annually, v. 342; and Pausanias, v. 370, 383; opponents and corruption of, after the Persian war, v. 378 *seq.*; and Timokreon, v. 379; first accusation of treason against, v. 380; two accusations of treason against, v. 381 *n.* 1; ostracism of, v. 382, 383 *n.* 1; second accusation of treason against, v. 383; flight and adventures of, on the second charge of *Medism*, v. 384 *seq.*; and Admêtus, v. 384; and Artaxerxes Longimanus, v. 386 *seq.*; in Persia, v. 386 *seq.*; rewards and death of, v. 389 *seq.*

Theodôrus of Samos, iv. 132 *n.*

Theodôrus the Syracusan, speech of, against Dionysius, x. 699 *seq.*

Theognis, iii. 61, iv. 124.

Theogony of the Greeks not a cosmogony, i. 3; of Hesiod, i. 5; Orphic, i. 22 *seq.*; Hesiodic and Orphic, compared, i. 27 *seq.*; Hesiodic legend of Pandôra in, i. 104.

Theoklês, the founder of Nâxos in Sicily, iii. 483; expels the Sikels from Leontini and Katana, iii. 488.

Theology, triple, of the pagan world, i. 588.

Theophrastus, the phytologist, i. 485 *n.*; his treatment of mythes, i. 550.

Theopompus, the Spartan king, ii. 570 *nn.*

Theopompus, the historian, on the Spartan empire, ix. 270 *n.*

Theôric Board at Athens, creation of, ix. 526.

Theôric Fund, allusions of Demosthenês to, xi. 466, 471; motion of Apollodorus about, xi. 485; not appropriated to war purposes till just before the battle of Chæroneia, xi. 492; true character of, xi. 492 *seq.*; attempt of the Athenian property-classes to evade direct taxation by recourse to, xi. 497; application of, to military purposes, xi. 679.
Theôrikon, viii. 439.
Theôrs, ii. 324.
Thêra, ii. 35; foundation of Kyrênê from, iv. 39 *seq.*
Theramenês, Peloponnesian fleet under, vii. 533; statement of, respecting the Four Hundred, viii. 18 *n.* 2; expedition of, to the Hellespont, vii. 159; accusation of the generals at Arginusæ by, viii. 246 *seq.*; probable conduct of, at Arginusæ, viii. 252 *seq.*, 254 *n.*; first embassy of, to Sparta, viii. 309; second embassy of, to Sparta, viii. 311; and the executions by the Thirty, viii. 328, 330, 334; and Kritias, dissentient views of, viii. 329 *seq.*, 339; exasperation of the majority of the Thirty against, viii. 339; denunciation of, by Kritias in the senate, viii. 340; reply of, to Kritias's denunciation in the senate, viii. 342; condemnation and death of, viii. 344 *seq.*
Theramenês the Athenian, viii. 25; his opposition to the Four Hundred, viii. 79 *seq.*; his impeachment of the embassy of the Four Hundred to Sparta, viii. 113 *seq.*
Therimachus, ix. 509.
Therma, Xerxes's movements from, to Thermopylæ, v. 112; capture of, by Archestratus, vi. 96.
Thermaic Gulf, original occupants on, iv. 17.
Thermopylæ, Greeks north of, in the first two centuries, ii. 367; Phokian defensive wall at, ii. 379; resolution of Greeks to defend against Xerxes, v. 97; the pass of, v. 99 *seq.*; path over Mount Œta avoiding, v. 107; movements of Xerxes from Therma to, v. 112; impressions of Xerxes about the defenders at, v. 118; repeated Persian attacks upon, repulsed, v. 120; debate among the defenders of, when the Persians approached their rear, v. 123; manœuvres ascribed to Xerxes respecting the dead at, v. 141; numbers slain at, on both sides, v. 142; inscriptions commemorative of the battle at, v. 142; effect of the battle of, on the Greeks and Xerxes, v. 144 *seq.*; conduct of the Peloponnesians after the battle of, v. 145; hopeless situation of the Athenians after the battle of, v. 147; Onomarchus at, xi. 360; Philip checked at, by the Athenians, xi. 413; position of Phalækus at, B.C. 347–346, xi. 520, 578; application of the Phokians to Athens for aid against Philip at, B.C. 347, xi. 522; importance of, to Philip and Athens, B.C. 347, xi. 524; march of Philip to, B.C. 346, xi. 564 *seq.*; plans of Philip against, B.C. 346, xi. 568; letters of Philip inviting the Athenians to join him at, xi. 576; Phokians at, B.C. 347–346, xi. 578 *seq.*; surrender of, to Philip, xi. 582; professions of Philip after his conquest of, xi. 586; special meeting of the Amphiktyons at, B.C. 339, xi. 663.
Thermus, ii. 390.
Thêro of Agrigentum and Gelo, v. 297 *seq.*; and Hiero, v. 307; severe treatment of Himeræans by, v. 307; death of, v. 311.
Thersander, the Orchomenian, at the Theban banquet to Mardonius, v. 216.
Thersitês, i. 405, ii. 96 *seq.*
Theseium at Athens, v. 415.
Thêseus, i. 232, 282 *seq.*; and the Minôtaur, i. 303; obtains burial for the fallen chiefs against Thêbes, i. 376; the political reforms of, ii. 29; and Menesthêus, ii. 30; restoration of the sons of, to his kingdom, ii. 31; consolidation of Attica by, iii. 92; bones of, conveyed to Athens, v. 413.
Thesmoi, iii. 101.
Thesmophoria, festival of, i. 60.
Thesmothetæ, iii. 100.
Thespiæ, hard treatment of, by Thebes, B.C. 423, vi. 618; severity of Thebes towards, B.C. 372, x. 219.
Thespian contingent of Lêonidas, v. 125.
Thespians, distress of, caused by Xerxes's invasion, v. 125 *n.* 2; at the battle of Leuktra, x. 245; expulsion of, from Bœotia, after the battle of Leuktra, x. 265.
Thespis and Solon, story of, iii. 198.
Thesprotians, iii. 555 *seq.*
Thessalian cities, disorderly confederacy of, ii. 377; and Athenian cavalry, skirmishes of, with Archidamus, vi. 181; cavalry sent home by Alexander, xii. 246.
Thessalians, migration of, from Thesprôtis to Thessaly, ii. 19; non-Hellenic character of, ii. 20; and their dependents in the first two centuries, ii. 368 *seq.*; character and condition of, ii. 371 *seq.*; and Xerxes's invasion, v. 92, 95; alliance of, with Athens and Argos, about B.C. 461, v. 435; Thebans, and Lokrians, war of, with the Phokians, B.C. 355, xi. 356.
Thessalus, son of Kimon, impeachment of Alkibiadês by, vii. 286.
Thessaly, affinities of, with Bœotia, ii. 24; quadruple division of, ii. 376; power of, when united, ii. 378; Athenian march against, B.C. 454, v. 451; Brasidas's march through, to Thrace, vi. 542 *seq.*; Lacedæmonian reinforcements to Brasidas prevented from passing through, vi. 614; state of, B.C. 370, x. 339; influence of Thebes in, B.C. 369, x. 340; expedition of Pelopidas to, B.C. 369, x. 340; expedition of Pelopidas to, B.C. 368, x. 360; expeditions of Pelopidas to, x. 361 *n.* 2; mission of Pelopidas to, B.C. 366, x. 387; expedition of Pelopidas to, B.C. 363, x. 415, 420 *seq.*; despots of, xi. 286 *seq.*; first expedition of Philip into, against the despots of Pheræ, xi. 366, 408, 412 *n.* 2; second expedition

of Philip into, against the despots of Pheræ, xi. 410 *seq.*; victory of Leosthenes over Antipater in, xii. 424.

Thêtes in legendary Greece, ii. 135; in Attica immediately before Solon's legislation, iii. 128 *seq.*; mutiny of, iii. 132.

Thetis and Pêleus, i. 257.

Thimbron, expedition of, to Asia, ix. 287; defeat and death of, ix. 502, xii. 580 *seq.*

Thirlwall's opinion on the partition of land ascribed to Lykurgus, ii. 541 *seq.*, 548, 552 *seq.*

Thirty at Athens, nomination of, viii. 321; proceedings of, viii. 325 *seq.*; executions by, viii. 326 *seq.*, 330 *seq.*, 336 *seq.*; discord among, viii. 329; three thousand hoplites nominated by, viii. 335; disarming of hoplites by, viii. 336; murders and spoliations by, viii. 336, 349; tyranny of, after the death of Theramenês, viii. 349; intellectual teaching forbidden by, viii. 350; and Sokratês, viii. 352; growing insecurity of, viii. 353; disgust in Greece at the enormities of, viii. 357; repulse and defeat of, by Thrasybulus at Phylê, viii. 362; seizure and execution of prisoners at Eleusis and Salamis by, viii. 364; defeat of, by Thrasybulus at Peiræus, viii. 367 *seq.*; deposition of, viii. 371; reaction against, on the arrival of king Pausanias, viii. 376; flight of the survivors of the, viii. 383; treatment of, B.C. 403, viii. 401; oppression and suffering of Athens under the, ix. 251; Athens rescued from the, ix. 252; the knights or horsemen supporters of the, ix. 253; Athens under the, a specimen of the Spartan empire, ix. 254; compared with the Lysandrian Dekarchies, ix. 257; and Kallibius, ix. 261; put down by the Athenians themselves, ix. 273.

Thorax and Xenophon, ix. 182 *seq.*

Thrace, Chalkidic colonies in, iv. 29 *seq.*; Greek settlements east of the Strymôn in, iv. 33; conquest of, by the Persians under Darius, iv. 369; and Macedonia, march of Mardonius into, iv. 423; contributions levied by Xerxes on towns in, v. 57; Brasidas's expedition to, vi. 503, 541 *seq.*; war continued in, during the one year's truce between Athens and Sparta, vi. 598; [illegible] Thrasybulus in, B.C. 407, [illegible]ates in, between B.C. 387–[illegible] *seq.*; Iphikrates in, B.C. 368–[illegible]12 *seq.*; Philip in, B.C. 351, xi. [illegible] B.C. 346, xi. 557, 559, and B.C. [illegible] xi. 622 *seq.*; Alexander's expe[illegible]to, xii. 29 *seq.*; march of Alex[illegible] to Thebes, xii. 48.

[illegible]pon Greece, i. 42; race [illegible]Asia Minor, iii. 281; Cher[illegible]; subject-allies of Athêns [illegible]y her, vi. 551 *seq.*: mercenaries under Diitrephês, vii. 490 *seq.*

Thracians in the time of Herodotus and Thucydides, ii. 120; and Phrygians, affinities between, iii. 282 *seq.*, 289; affinities and migrations of, iii. 282 *seq.*; numbers and abode of, iv. 26; general character of, iv. 26 *seq.*; Asiatic characteristics of, iv. 29; venality of, vi. 290 *n.*

Thrasius, xi. 244, 254.

Thrasybulus of Syracuse, v. 313 *seq.*

Thrasybulus, the Athenian, speech of, at Samos, viii. 65; efforts of, at Samos, in favour of Alkibiadês, viii. 68; in Thrace, viii. 195; accusation of the generals at Arginusæ by, viii. 247 *seq.*; flight of, from Attica, viii. 330; occupation of Phylê, and repulse and defeat of the Thirty by, viii. 361; occupation of Peiræus by, viii. 366; victory of, over the Thirty at Peiræus, viii. 367 *seq.*; increasing strength of, at Peiræus, viii. 373; straitened condition of, in Peiræus, viii. 375; at Peiræus, king Pausanias's attack upon, viii. 378; and the Ten at Athens, peace between, viii. 379; and the exiles, restoration of, to Athens, viii. 382; assistance of, to Evander and others, viii. 418 *n.* 3; honorary reward to, viii. 425; aid to the Thebans by, ix. 411; acquisitions of, in the Hellespont and Bosphorus, ix. 508; victory of, in Lesbos, ix. 509; death and character of, ix. 509.

Thrasydæus, v. 307; cruel government, defeat, and death of, v. 311, ix. 310, 314.

Thrasyklês and Strombichidês, expedition of, to Chios, vii. 515.

Thrasyllus, vii. 99, 101; at Samos, B.C. 411, viii. 64, 66; at Lesbos, viii. 137; eluded by Mindarus, viii. 138; at Elæus, viii. 146; repulse of Agis by, viii. 173; expedition of, to Ionia, viii. 174; and Alkibiadês, at the Hellespont, viii. 176.

Thrasylochus and Demosthenês, xi. 375 *n.* 2.

Thrasymachus, rhetorical precepts of, viii. 501; doctrine of, in Plato's Republic, viii. 536 *seq.*

Three thousand, nominated by the Thirty at Athens, viii. 335.

Thucydidês, altered intellectual and ethical standard in the age of, i. 494; his treatment of ancient mythes, i. 527, 542 *seq.*; his version of the Trojan war, i. 543 *seq.*; on the dwellings of the earliest Greeks, ii. 147; his date for the return of the Herakleids, ii. 18; silence of, on the treaty between Athens and Persia, v. 457; descent of, vi. 17 *n.* 2; various persons named, vi. 39 *n.* 2; his division of the year, vi. 155 *n.* 1; his judgment respecting Periklês, vi. 234, 238; first mention of Kleon by, vi. 331; reflections of, on the Korkyræan massacre, B.C. 427, vi. 377 *seq.*; structure of his history, vi. 419 *n.*; judgment of, on Kleon's success at Pylus, vi. 472 *seq.*; on Kythêra, vi. 496 *n.*; and the capitulation of Amphipolis to Brasidas, vi. 558, 560, 564 *seq.*; banishment of, vi. 565 *seq.*; on Kleon's views and motives in desiring war, B.C. 422, vi. 622 *seq.*, 627; passages of, on the battle of Amphi-

polis, vi. 639 *nn.*, 641 *n.*, 644 *n.*; feelings of, towards Brasidas and Kleon, vi. 655; treatment of Kleon by, vi. 655, 660 *seq.*; dialogue set forth by, between the Athenian envoys and Executive Council of Mêlos, vii. 149 *seq.*, 157 *seq.*; his favourable judgment of the Athenians at the restoration of the democracy, B.C. 411, viii. 121 *seq.*; study of, by Demosthenes, xi. 376.

Thucydidês, son of Melêsias, v. 463; rivalry of, with Periklês, vi. 21 *seq.*; ostracised, vi. 27; history of, after his ostracism, vi. 39 *n.* 2.

Thurians, defeat of, by the Lucanians, xi. 17.

Thurii, foundation of, vi. 18 *seq.*; few Athenian settlers at, vi. 20; revolution at, B.C. 413, x. 530.

Thyamia, surprise of, by the Phliasians and Chares, x. 372.

Thyestêan banquet, the, i. 221.

Thyestês, i. 219 *seq.*

Thymocharês, defeat of, near Eretria, viii. 97 *seq.*

Thymôdes, xii. 157, 169.

Thynians, iii. 281.

Thyrea, conquest of, ii. 605; capture of, by Nikias, B.C. 424, vi. 498; stipulation about, between Sparta and Argos, B.C. 420, vii. 38.

Thyssagetæ, iii. 330.

Tigris, the Ten Thousand Greeks at the, ix. 86 *seq.*; retreat of the Ten Thousand along the, ix. 121 *seq.*; forded by Alexander, xii. 205; voyage of Nearchus from the mouth of the Indus to that of the, xii. 317, 318; Alexander's voyage up the, to Opis, xii. 327.

Tilphusios Apollo, origin of the name, i. 65.

Timæus's treatment of mythes, i. 551.

Timagoras, his mission to Persia, and execution, x. 381, 383, 384 *n.* 1.

Timandra, i. 231.

Timarchus, decree of, xi. 511, 512 *n.*

Timasion, and Xenophon, ix. 182 *seq.*

Time, Grecian computation of, ii. 155 *n.* 2.

Timêgenidas, death of, v. 252.

Timocracy of Solon, iii. 158 *seq.*

Timokrates, the Rhodian, ix. 398 *seq.*

Timokrates, of Syracuse, xi. 127 *seq.*

Timokreon and Themistoklês, v. 379.

Timolaus, speech of, ix. 424.

Timoleon, appointment of, to aid Syracuse, xi. 191, 200; life and character of, before B.C. 344, xi. 192 *seq.*; and Timophanes, xi. 192 *seq.*; preparations of, for his expedition to Syracuse, xi. 201; voyage of, from Corinth to Sicily, xi. 202 *seq.*; message from Hiketas to, xi. 203; at Rhegium, xi. 203 *seq.*; at Tauromenium, xi. 207; at Adranum, xi. 209, 220; first arrival of, at Syracuse, xi. 211; surrender of Ortygia to, xi. 212 *seq.*; reinforcement from Corinth to, xi. 215, 219, 222; admiration excited by the successes of, xi. 215, 228; advantage of Ortygia to, xi. 219; return of, from Adranum to Syracuse, xi. 223; Messênê declares in favour of, xi. 223; capture of Epipolæ by, xi. 226; favour of the gods towards, xi. 228, 253, 255; ascribes his successes to the gods, xi. 230; temptations and conduct of, on becoming master of Syracuse, xi. 231 *seq.*; demolition of the Dionysian stronghold in Ortygia by, xi. 233; erection of courts of justice at Syracuse by, xi. 234; recall of exiles to Syracuse by, xi. 235; capitulation of Hiketas with at Leontini, xi. 241; puts down the despots in Sicily, xi. 241, 254 *seq.*; march of, from Syracuse against the Carthaginians, xi. 243 *seq.*; and Thrasius, xi. 244, 254; victory of, over the Carthaginians at the Krimêsus, xi. 246 *seq.*; and Mamerkus, xi. 255 *seq.*; partial defeats of his troops, xi. 255; victory of, over Hiketas at the Damurias, xi. 256; surrender of Leontini and Hiketas to, xi. 257; peace of, with the Carthaginians, xi. 258; capture of Messênê and Hippon by, xi. 259; lays down his power at Syracuse, xi. 261; great influence of, after his resignation at Syracuse, xi. 262, 273; and the immigration of new Greek settlers into Sicily, xi. 265 *seq.*; residence of, at Syracuse, xi. 268; in the public assembly at Syracuse, xi. 269 *seq.*; uncorrupted moderation and public spirit of, xi. 272; freedom and prosperity in Sicily, introduced by, xi. 273; death and obsequies of, xi. 274; and Dion, contrast between, xi. 277 *seq.*; the constitution established at Syracuse by, exchanged for an oligarchy, xii. 531.

Timomachus in the Hellespont, x. 513.

Timophanes and Timoleon, xi. 192 *seq.*

Timotheus, son of Konon, x. 149; circumnavigation of Peloponnesus by, x. 179; at Zakynthus, x. 192; appointment of, to aid Korkyra, B.C. 373, x. 195; delay of, in aiding Korkyra, x. 198 *seq.*, 199 *n.*; and Iphikrates, x. 202, 409, 410 *n.* 1; trial and acquittal of, x. 207 *seq.*, 209 *n.*; expedition of, to Asia Minor, B.C. 366, x. 345, 402 *seq.*; and Charidemus, x. 411, 413; successes of, in Macedonia and Chalkidikê, B.C. 365–364, x. 411; failure of, at Amphipolis, B.C. 36[illegible], x. [illegible] 413; in the Chersonese, 419, 507; in the Hellespont, 316; accusation of, by Ch[illegible] *seq.*, 322 *n.*; arrogance and [illegible] of, xi. 320; exile and death of

Timotheus, of the Pontic He[illegible] 629.

Tiribazus and the Te[illegible] 136, 140; embassy of [illegible] and others to, ix. 498 [illegible] das at Susa, ix. 55[illegible], [illegible] Antalkidas, ix. 534; and Orontes, x. 30, 31.

Tisamenus, son of Orestês, ii. 6, 10, 11 *n.* 1.

Tisamenus, the Athenian, decree of, viii. 405.

Tisiphonus, despot at Pheræ, xi. 290.
Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus, embassy from, to Sparta, B.C. 413, vii. 503; and Chalkideus, treaty between, vii. 518; first treaty of, with the Peloponnesians, vii. 518; payment of the Peloponnesian fleet by, vii. 535; and Astyochus, treaty between, vii. 543 *seq.*; second treaty of, with the Peloponnesians, vii. 543 *seq.*; and Lichas, at Miletus, vii. 548; double-dealing and intrigues of, with the Peloponnesian fleet, vii. 548, 551 *seq.*; escape and advice of Alkibiadês to, viii. 3 *seq.*; and the Greeks, Alkibiadês acts as interpreter between, viii. 6; reduction of pay to the Peloponnesian fleet by, viii. 6; third treaty of, with the Peloponnesians, viii. 31 *seq.*; envoy from, to Sparta, B.C. 411, viii. 133; false promises of, to Mindarus, viii. 134; and the Phœnician fleet at Aspendus, viii. 134, 136, 154; and the Peloponnesians at the Hellespont, viii. 153 *seq.*; Alkibiadês arrested by, viii. 161; charge of, against Cyrus the Younger, ix. 9; negotiations and convention of, with the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 79 *seq.*; retreating march of the Ten Thousand under, ix. 84 *seq.*; treachery of, towards Klearchus and other Greeks, ix. 93 *seq.*; plan of, against the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 101; attack of, on the Ten Thousand Greeks, ix. 122; and the Asiatic Greeks, ix. 286; and Derkyllidas, ix. 290, 304 *seq.*; and Agesilaus, ix. 362, 370; death of, ix. 372.
Titanides, the, i. 6.
Titans, the, i. 6, 7, 11; the Orphic, i. 23.
Τίθεσθαι τὰ ὅπλα, meaning of, vi. 155 *n.* 2, 485 *n.* 1, 508 *n.*, 524 *n.* 2, 528 *n.*
Tithraustes supersedes Tissaphernes, and opens negotiations with Agesilaus, ix. 372; sends an envoy to Greece against Sparta, ix. 398 *seq.*; victory of Chares and Artabazus over, xi. 25.
Tolmidês, voyage of, round Peloponnesus, v. 450; defeat and death of, v. 471.
Tomi, legendary origin of the name, i. 325 *n.* 3, xii. 641.
Topographical impossibilities in the legend of Troy no obstacles to its reception, i. 448; criticisms [illegible] applicable to the legend of Troy, i. 4[illegible]; hikr
Torgium, vi[illegible] Agathokles over Deinokrates at [illegible] 605.
Torônê, surprise and capture of, by Brasidas, vi. 376; capture of, by Kleon, vi. 632.
Trachêia, ii. 302.
Torture, use of, to elicit truth, vii. 274 *n.*
Trade and occupations, encouragement to, at Athens, iii. 185.
Trachons, fortifications of, in early Greece, ii. 145 *seq.*
Trades, Grecian deities of, i. 465.
Tradition, Greek, matter of, uncertified, i. 580; fictitious matter in, does not imply fraud, i. 581.
Trœzen, removal of Athenians to, on Xerxes's approach, v. 148.
Tragedies, lost, of Promêthêus, i. 107 *n.* 2.
Tragedy, Athenian, growth of, viii. 435; Athenian, abundant production of, viii. 437; Athenian, effect of, on the public mind, viii. 440; Grecian, ethical sentiment in, viii. 460.
Trapezus, legendary origin of, i. 238; date of the foundation of, iii. 337 *n.* 2; the Ten Thousand at, xi. 155, 169 *seq.*; departure of the Ten Thousand from, ix. 172.
Trench of Artaxerxes from the Euphrates to the wall of Media, ix. 54, 56 *n.* 1.
Triballi, defeat of Philip by, xi. 639; victory of Alexander over, xii. 31.
Tribes and demes of Kleisthenês, iv. 176 *seq.*
Tribute of the subject-allies of Athens, vi. 6 *n.* 3, 9 *n.* 2.
Trierarchic reform of Demosthenês, xi. 639 *seq.*
Trinakria, town of, vii. 172.
Triphylia, Minyæ in, ii. 37; and Elis, ii. 592, x. 356, 429.
Triphylians, ii. 408.
Triple theology of the pagan world, i. 588; partition of past time by Varro, i. 153.
Tripolis, iii. 361.
Trireme, equipment of a, vi. 271 *n.*
Τρίτανι τἄχιμες, exclamation of, on the Greeks and the Olympic games, v. 155.
Tritôn and the Argonauts, i. 326.
Tritônis, Lake, iv. 47 *n.* 2; prophecies about, iv. 52.
Trittyes, iii. 71, 91 *n.*
Trôad, the, i. 451.
Trôas, Alexandreia, i. 441.
Trôas, historical, and the Teukrians, i. 451.
Trojan war, Thucydidês's version of, i. 543 *seq.*; the date of, i. 36, 76.
Trojans, allies of, i. 398; new allies of, i. 404, 405; and Phrygians, i. 452.
Trophonius and Agamêdês, i. 177.
Trôs, i. 387.
Troy, legend of, i. 386–458.
Tsuen, capture of, by Agathokles, xii. 560; mutiny in the army of Agathokles at, xii. 579; Archagathus blocked up by the Carthaginians at, xii. 593, 597; victory of the Carthaginians over Agathokles near, xii. 598; nocturnal panic in the Carthaginian camp near, xii. 598; Agathokles deserts his army at, and they capitulate, xii. 599, 600.
Turpis, chronicle of, i. 635.
Tyche, near Syracuse, vii. 334.
Tydeus, i. 207, 369.
Tyndareus and Lêda, i. 230 *seq.*
Tyndarion, vii. 165.
Tymbaris, foundation of, xi. 5.
Types, manifold, of the Homeric gods, i. 471.
Typhaon and Echidna, offspring of, i. 10.
Typhœus, i. 12.
Tyre, iii. 388 *seq.*; siege and subjugation of, by Nebuchadnezzar, iii. 444; and Carthage, amicable relations between, iii. 465;

siege and capture of, by Alexander, xii. 179 *seq.*
Tyrô, different accounts of, i. 148.
Tyrrhenians, O. Müller's view of the origin of, iii. 242.
Tyrtæus and the first Messenian war, ii. 568, 570, 575; efficiency of, in the second Messenian war, ii. 580 *seq.*; poetry of, iv. 110; age and metres of, iv. 104.

U.

Uranos, i. 6, 7.
Usury and the Jewish law, iii. 150 *n.*
Utica, iii. 365; capture of, by Agathokles, xii. 590.
Uxii, conquest of, by Alexander, xii. 231.

V.

Varro's triple division of pagan theology, i. 588; his triple partition of past time, i. 653.
Veneti, the, i. 431.
Villagers regarded as inferiors by Hellens, ii. 345, 349.
Villages numerous in early Greece, ii. 347.
Volsunga Saga, i. 640.

W.

War, the first sacred, iv. 84 *seq.*, v. 468; the social, xi. 310, 325; the second sacred, xi. 339 *seq.*, 519, 582 *seq.*; the third sacred, xi. 646.
Wise men of Greece, seven, iv. 126 *seq.*
Wolf's Prolegomena to Homer, ii. 191; his theory on the composition of the Iliad and Odyssey, ii. 202 *seq.*
Women, Solon's laws respecting, iii. 188.
Wooden horse of Troy, the, i. 410, 418.
"*Works and Days*," races of men in, i. 88 *seq.*; differs from the Theogony and Homer, i. 91; mingled ethical and mythical sentiment in, i. 92 *seq.*; the earliest didactic poem, i. 95; personal feeling pervading, i. 98; probable age of, i. 99; legend of Pandôra in, i. 103; general feeling of the poet in, i. 105; on women, i. 106.
Writing, unknown to Homeric and Hesiodic Greeks, ii. 157; few traces of, long after the Homeric age, ii. 192; among the Greeks, iv. 130.

X.

Xanthippus and Miltiadês, iv. 483, 492.
Xanthippus, son of Periklês, vi. 137.
Xenarès and Ideobûlus, the anti-Athenian ethnors, vii. 32 *seq.*
Xenias and Pasion, desertion of Cyrus by, ix. 37.
Xenodokus, xii. 574, 594, 596, 597.
Xenokrates, embassy of, to Antipater, xii. 435, 436, 447.
Xenophanes, his condemnation of ancient legends, i. 494; Thalès, and Pythagoras, i. 495 *seq.*; his treatment of ancient mythes, i. 562; philosophy and school of, iv. 523 *seq.*
Xenophon, his treatment of ancient mythes, i. 551; on Spartan women, ii. 518, 520 *n.* 2; his Cyropædia, iii. 311 *n.*, iv. 247; his version of Cyrus's capture of Babylon, iv. 288 *n.*; on the dikasteries, vi. 58, 63 *n.* 2; and Plato, evidence of, about Sokratês, viii. 555 *seq.*, 609 *n.*; the preceptorial and positive exhortation of Sokratês exhibited by, viii. 612; remarks of, on the accusation against Sokratês, viii. 650; on the condemnation of Sokratês, viii. 663; and his joining of the Cyrean army, ix. 16; length of the parasang in, ix. 19 *n.* 3; dream of, after the seizure of the generals, ix. 104; address of, to the captains of the Ten Thousand, after the seizure of the generals, ix. 105; chosen a general of the Ten Thousand, ix. 108; first speech of, to the Ten Thousand, after being chosen a general, ix. 109 *seq.*; great ascendency acquired by, over the Ten Thousand, ix. 113 *seq.*; and Cheirisophus, ix. 125, 131, 145, 146; prowess of, against the Persians, ix. 125 *seq.*; in the mountains of the Karduchians, ix. 129 *seq.*; at the Kentritês, ix. 136 *seq.*; propositions of, to the Ten Thousand at Trapezus, ix. 170; his idea of founding a new city [illegible] the Euxine, ix. 179 *seq.*; charges against, and speeches of, at Kotyôra, ix. 181 *seq.*; offered the sole command of the Ten Thousand, ix. 198; at Herakleia and Calpê, ix. 199 *seq.*; and Kleander, ix. 209, 212; at Byzantium, ix. 211; and Anaxibius, ix. 223, 225 *seq.*; takes leave of the Ten Thousand, ix. 224; rejoins the Ten Thousand, ix. 226; and Aristarchus, ix. 228; and [illegible]uthes, ix. 231, 230 *seq.*; his poverty and sacrifice to Zeus Meilichios, ix. 235 *seq.*; [illegible] Pergamus in Mysia, ix. 237 *seq.*; takes his second farewell of the Ten Thousand, ix. 2[illegible]; [illegible] Cyrean army under the [illegible], ix. 241, 289, 432, 436; banishment of, [illegible] Athenians, ix. 241, 242 *n.*; at Skilus, ix. 243 *seq.*; later life of, ix. 245; and Demarchus, ix. 246 *n.* 2; on the conduct of Sparta between B.C. 387-372, x. 106; partiality of [illegible] Sparta in his Hellenica, x. 315 *n.*; [illegible] the results of the battle of Mantinea, x. 482.
Xerxes, chosen as successor to Darius, v. 2; instigated to the invasion of Greece, v. 4; resolved to invade Greece, v. 6; deliberation and dreams of, respecting the invasion of Greece, v. 9 *seq.*; vast preparations of, for the invasion of Greece, v. 16 *seq.*; march of, to Sardis, and collection of his forces there, v. 18; throws two bridges across the Hellespont, v. 19; [illegible] of, on the destruction of his bridges across the Hellespont, v. 21; [illegible] of the Hellespont by, v. 21 [illegible] bridges of, over the Hellespont, [illegible] 24 *seq.*;

00029999

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 23 March, 2016